

1777.

E 15265

REVIEW,

ON

DR. HUNTER'S INDIAN MUSALMANS:

ARE THEY BOUND IN CONSCIENCE TO REBEL
AGAINST THE QUEEN?

BY

SYED AHMAD KHAN BAHADUR C. S. I.

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH CORRECTED BY A FRIEND.

BENARES:

PRINTED AT THE MEDICAL HALL PRESS.

1872.

DEDICATION.



TO MY OWN AND INDIA'S WARM FRIEND,

CAPTAIN G. F. I. GRAHAM,

THIS

BOOK IS DEDICATED.

REVIEW

ON DR. HUNTER'S INDIAN MUSALMANS.

ARE THEY BOUND IN CONSCIENCE TO REBEL AGAINST THE QUEEN?

THE attention of the public has been lately turned to the state of Mahomedan feeling in India, owing to three causes, *viz.*, the Wahabi trials, Dr. Hunter's book on the "Indian Musalmans," and the murder of the late lamented Chief Justice Norman. Dr. Hunter's work has made a great sensation in India, and has been read with avidity by all classes of the community. I commenced its perusal hoping that a light would be shed upon what, to the general public, has been hitherto an obscure subject; and as I had heard that the author was a warm friend of Mahomedans, my interest in the work was great. No man, and especially no Mahomedan, can have perused this, the accomplished author's last celebrated work, without being impressed with his extreme literary skill, his Macaulay-like talent of vivifying everything that his pen treats of. Literary skill is not, however, everything, and an author writing for the Indian as well as for the English public should be careful not to so color the subject, which he treats of, as to make it mischievous and of small value as an historical work. I am aware that many of the ruling race in India are under the impression that English literature, both books and newspapers, seldom, if ever, permeates the strata of native society. As regards general literature, this impression is correct as far as the millions are concerned; but, on particular subjects, such as the state of feeling of the English to the natives, religious questions, or matters affecting taxation, it is a mistaken one.

Natives anxiously con all articles bearing upon the feelings with which their rulers regard them. Articles sneering at them or misrepresenting their thoughts and feelings, sink deep into their soul, and work much harm. Although all cannot read, they manage to hear the contents of this and that article or work from those who can, and the subject usually receives a good deal of embellishment as it is passed from one to the other. Articles or books on religious and fiscal questions are also eagerly commented on by a large proportion of the population.

What books and newspapers enunciate is, by the general native public, believed to be the opinion of the whole English community—official or non-official—from the veriest clerk to the Governor General in Council—aye, even to the Queen herself! Such being the case, writers should be careful of their facts when treating of any important subject, and having got their facts, ought to avoid all exaggeration or misrepresentation. Now when we find an official, high in office and in favor with Government, giving utterance to assertions and assumptions such as those contained in Dr. Hunter's work, it is but natural that we Mahomedans should come to the conclusion that the author's opinions are shared in more or less by the whole English community. I have before mentioned that I had expected great things from Dr. Hunter's book. Alas! that I should add one more to the long list of disappointed men. Friend to the Mahomedans, as Dr. Hunter no doubt is, his friendship, as represented by this his last work, has worked us great harm. "God save me from my friends!" was the exclamation which rose to my lips as I perused the author's pages. I perfectly admit the kindly feeling towards Mahomedans which pervades the whole book, and for this I heartily thank the talented author. At the same time, I regret deeply that his good intentions should have been so grievously frustrated by the manner in which he has written, and that he has used his "power of the pen" in a way calculated still

more to embitter the minds of Englishmen against the already little loved Moslems.

Dr. Hunter expressly states that it is only the Bengal Mahomedans to whom he applies the subject-matter of the book, and that it is only them whom he knows intimately. The book, however, abounds in passages which lead the reader to believe that it is not merely the Bengal Mahomedans that the author treats of, but the Mahomedans throughout India. The title of the work itself proves this. "Our Indian Musalmans. Are they bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen?" Again at page 11, there occurs the following passage:—"Discussions which disclose the Mahomedan masses eagerly drinking in the poisoned teachings of the Apostles of Insurrection, and a small minority anxiously seeking to get rid of the duty to rebel by ingenious interpretations of their sacred Law." Again on the same page—"The Musalmans of India are, and have been for many years, a source of chronic danger to the British power in India." With a knowledge, therefore, only of Bengal Mahomedans, the author gives us the general feeling of Mahomedans throughout India. As a cosmopolitan Mahomedan of India, I must raise my voice in opposition to Dr. Hunter in defence of my fellow-countrymen. I know full well the arduousness of the task which I have undertaken—the difficulty which encompasses every advocate of a cause which has been pre and misjudged by men of a different race. I only ask for an impartial hearing in the words of the Bishop of Manchester, spoken at Nottingham last month:—"All things are possible to him that believeth, and where there is true faith there is certain to be no obliquity of conduct." Being firm in my belief in what I am about to write, I hope that it may be possible for me to convince the public that all is not gold that glitters, and that all is not exactly as Dr. Hunter would have it believed.

As Dr. Hunter's work represents Wahabi-ism and rebellion

against the British Government as synonymous, I will first proceed to review the light in which the former is presented to the Indian public by the learned doctor, and I will then pass on to the consideration of the latter question. Wahabi-ism has withal been little understood by the world at large, and it is rather difficult to put it in a comprehensive light before the public. In my opinion, what the Protestant is to Roman Catholic, so is the Wahabi to the other Mahomedan creeds. A work on Wahabi-ism was translated into English, and published in the 13th Volume of the *Royal Asiatic Journal* in 1852. In it the doctrines of the faith are pretty accurately defined, and Dr. Hunter has reduced them to the following seven doctrines:—“*First*, absolute reliance upon one God; *second*, absolute renunciation of any mediatory agent between man and his Maker, including the rejection of the prayers of the saints, and even of the semi-divine mediation of Mahomed himself; *third*, the right of private interpretation of the Mahomedan Scriptures, and the rejection of all priestly glosses of the Holy Writ; *fourth*, absolute rejection of all the forms, ceremonies, and outward observances with which the mediæval and modern Mahomedans have overlaid the pure faith; *fifth*, constant looking for the Prophet (Imam), who will lead the true Believers to victory over the Infidels; *sixth*, constant recognition, both in theory and practice, of the obligation to wage war upon all Infidels; *seventh*, implicit obedience to the spiritual guide.”

Now, there are several errors here. The latter part of the second doctrine is so ambiguously worded that the meaning does not stand out very clear: it ought to stand thus—“And to recognize Mahomed as nothing more than an inspired man, and to disbelieve in any power of mediation by saints or prophets, including Mahomed himself, before the Holy Tribunal.” The third doctrine is also ambiguous, and I would amend it thus—“Right of every individual to interpret the Koran according to his lights, and not

to be bound to follow implicitly the interpretation put upon the same by any former priest." The fifth doctrine is quite obscure, and its true meaning is much altered. It bears a great affinity to the belief of the Jews and Christians—in the advent of the Messiah of the former and of the second coming of Christ of the latter. Mahomedans believe that before the end of the world, and before the second advent of Christ, an Imam will descend on the earth to lead true Believers to victory over the Infidels. Many Mahomedans disbelieve in this, and regard it as a story invented by the Jews, and which has crept into their religion. However this may be, it will be observed that Dr. Hunter has perverted its meaning, and has represented the present generation of Wahabis as expecting the Imam to lead them to victory against the English. The sixth doctrine has also suffered at the author's hands. Had he added the words—"provided that the Musalmans leading the *jihad* be not the subjects of those Infidels, living under them in peace, and without any oppression being exercised towards them—provided that they have not left their property and families under the protection of such Infidels—provided that there exists no treaty between them and the Infidels—and provided that the Musalmans be powerful enough to be certain of success"—had, I say, all these provisions been added by our author, his rendering of this doctrine would have been correct. His object, however, being to present the Wahabi doctrines in their most terrifying form, he wisely omitted all these provisions. I do not understand what the author means by the words "spiritual guide" in the seventh doctrine. If, by it, he implies a guide of faith, he is in error, as, by the third doctrine, Wahabis are not bound to follow any priest blindly. If, however, he means a Mahomedan ruler, he is right. One thing, however, he has omitted to tell us, *viz.*, that Mahomedans are bound to obey an Infidel ruler as long as he does not interfere with their religion. I would particularly urge on my readers to bear these doctrines in mind as now interpreted by

me ; Dr. Hunter's rendering of them being ambiguous and calculated to mislead. I shall now proceed to show the origin of Wahabi-ism — what it was formerly called, when the present name was given it, and why.

Dr. Hunter writes (page 57) :—“It (Wahabi-ism) is a system which reduces the religion of Mahomed to a pure Theism.” This is quite true ; I would merely remark, however, that this is exactly what Mahomedanism was in the days of Mahomed, before it was encrusted with its present forms and ceremonies by mediæval and modern Mahomedans. Mahomedanism was at first for many long years a pure and simple Theism ; but in the second century of the Higra, when the ideas of the learned men as to its principles were reduced to writing, it was divided into the four churches—Hanafi, Sháfai, Málki, and Humbali. For some time it remained optional for Mahomedans to choose and follow any doctrine of any of these four churches. When, however, Bani Uinaiyá and Bani Abbás became kings, an edict was issued directing all Mahomedans to embrace the whole doctrines of any one church of the above four. Those who disobeyed this edict were punished. By this unjust order, free opinion was summarily suppressed, and religious intolerance gained supremacy. There were still, however, many who clung to the true faith in its primitive simplicity, but who dared not breathe their opinions except to a trusted few. Their name was then Ahal-i-Hadis, *i. e.*, believers in the sayings of the Prophet, who were not bound down by the doctrines of the four churches. As time went on, the order first alluded to was more and more strictly enforced until, with the majority of Mahomedans it became the principal article of faith. The Ahal-i-Hadis gradually became hated by the masses, and in Mahomedan law-books they were held up to the execration of the Faithful. This state of affairs prevailed throughout the whole Mahomedan world until the beginning of the seventeenth century A. D. A civil war

breaking out just then in Arabia, Abdul Waháb, son of the chief of Nejd, defeated his opponents and ascended a throne of his own making. His faith was that of the Ahal-i-Hadis, and as he was supreme in his own country, he openly preached and spread the doctrines of the original creed. He died and was succeeded by a ruler of the same faith, who soon after his accession prepared for a pilgrimage to Mecca. On asking, however, the Sharif of Mecca for leave to perform the pilgrimage according to the precepts of his faith, his request was refused.

The applicant denied the right of any one to refuse him entry and marched on and conquered both Mecca and Medina. He then proceeded to abolish all the forms and ceremonies with which pure Mahomedanism had become encumbered—demolished the four Towers built within the Holy Temple for the worshippers of the four churches, and destroyed the tombs of saints which were worshipped as idols. He was, however, soon after defeated by Muhammad Ali, Pasha of Egypt, and compelled to evacuate both Mecca and Medina. The Mahomedan world was plunged into grief at the—in their opinion—sacrileges perpetrated by the Ahal-i-Hadis, and a bitter enmity sprung up between the Turks and the followers of Abdul Waháb. The latter were henceforth styled Wahabis, instead of the former name, Ahal-i-Hadis.

This was exactly what the Jews did to the followers of Christ when they called them Nazarenes. In India, during the Mahomedan rule, the Turk and Pathan kings, who were of the Hanafi sect were strictly averse to religious toleration, and the same state of affairs prevailed during the sovereignty of the Mogul Emperors, except during the latter part of the reign of Akbar.

The followers of Ahal-i-Hadis, *i. e.*, the Wahabis, could not, therefore, then preach their faith without great danger. On the establishment of British rule, however, owing to the English

principle of strict religious toleration, the followers of Ahal-i-Hadis again came to the front and preached openly and fearlessly. The Indian Mahomedans, however, hated them as cordially as the Arabian Ahal-i-Hadis were hated by the Turks, and they also called them Wahabis. Such is the history of Wahabi-ism, the bug-bear of Dr. Hunter.

In a foot-note, page 22, Dr. Hunter says that the word "Wahabi" belongs to a later period, and that this sect was first styled "Gházis" or "Jihadis." This is quite a mistake on his part; Gházis or Jihadis are men who join in a religious war without any distinction of sect. There have been, and there still are, Jihadis of all sects, but to call the Wahabis, as a whole, Jihadis, is utterly wrong. There were Jihadis amongst the Christians in the days of the Crusades.

I shall now endeavour to explain the faith and persuasion of the frontier tribes amongst whom Dr. Hunter establishes the Rebel Camp.

The mountain tribes on our North-West Frontier are Sunis. They belong to the Hanafi sect, and are stricter in the observance of their religion than their co-religionists of the plains. The latter bear no enmity towards the other three Mahomedan sects; whilst the hostility of the mountain tribes to all other sects is bitter in the extreme. An outsider has no security for his life or property whilst in their country, unless he change his tenets, and adapt them to those of the Hanafis amongst whom his lot is cast. A friend of mine, the late Háji Syed Mabammad, one of the Sháfai sect, and an inhabitant of Georgia, some years ago, travelled amongst these frontier tribes. He related to me the many hardships and severities to which he was subjected on account of his faith, and said that he never felt himself secure in any town, village, or even mosque. These wild denizens of the hills generally take, as their

text-books, commentaries on the Hanafi Church, of which *Dur-i-Mukhtár* is one. This was written in the year 1071 Hijra, or A. D. 1660, and is the religious work most venerated by them. It contains some Arabic verses upholding the Hanafi doctrines in preference to all others. A translation of one of these, showing the hatred borne by the Hanafis to the followers of the other churches, is as follows:—"May the curses of our God, innumerable as the sands of the sea, fall upon him who followeth not the doctrines of Abu-Hanifá." These hill tribes lay great stress upon the worship of tombs of saints and monasteries, especially those of Peer Bábá in Bonair and Káká Sáhib in Kotáh. I have never yet met any Pathan of any other faith than the Hanafi, or any inclined to Wahabi-ism. In the *Hayát Afgáni*, however, an Urdu history published at Lahore in 1867, and written by a loyal Mahomedan in the service of Government, I find the following passage:—"But of late the followers of Mulla Syed Meer of Kotáh are looked upon as Wahabis, and are held in contempt by the people of Swat, subjects of the Akhoond of Swat and staunch Hanafis. Most of the Atmanzais and the descendants of Nasir-ul-lah of Garhi Ismáil are the partizans of Mullá Syed Meer, whilst all the other mountain tribes follow the Akhoond of Swat." From the foregoing, it is evident how utterly antagonistic Wahabi-ism is to the faith of the frontier tribes; and, as far as religion is concerned, how impracticable it is to form a coalition between the Pathans and the Wahabis. The latter, who in 1824 settled themselves in the hills, determined to wage war to the death against the hated Sikhs, could never persuade the hill tribes to look with favor on their religious tenets. Hating each other as they did, however, they smarting under the oppressions and severities of the Sikhs, made common cause against them. It was these very Pathans, however, who betrayed the Wahabis to the Sikhs, and it was owing to them that Syed Ahmed and Moulavi Ismail Sahéb were afterwards slain. These facts must be borne in mind, as they are absolutely necessary

to a proper understanding of the Wahabi history, represented by Dr. Hunter as a great coalition of the mountain tribes.

In the first chapter of his work, Dr. Hunter has given us an account of the establishment of the Wahabi rebel camp. I demur, however, to many of his statements, and will now proceed to give a short account of the Indian Wahabis, without which it is impossible to show in what points our author has been misled, and how greatly he has exaggerated the facts of the case.

The history of the Indian Wahabis is divided into five periods. The first extends from 1823 to 1830, *i. e.*, from the year Syed Ahmed and Moulavi Ismail preached and inaugurated the holy war against the Sikhs, the oppressors of their Mahomedan subjects, to the time when Peshawur was re-captured from the hands of their followers. The second extends from 1830 to 1831, *i. e.*, from the re-conquest of Peshawur to the death of Syed Ahmed and Moulavi Ismail. The third embraces the period from the death of these leaders to the time when, after the annexation of the Punjab by the British, the Wahabis, and amongst them Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali, were sent from the frontier to their homes in Hindustan, *viz.*, from 1831 to 1847. The fourth extends from 1847 to the second expedition of Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali to the frontier and to their death. The fifth is the present period which Dr. Hunter erroneously calls the period of Wahabi insurrection. The first period of the Wahabi history was its golden age. Everything that the Wahabis of that age did was known to Government, and they were not, at that time, in any way suspected of disloyalty to the British. Mahomedans at that time openly preached a holy war against the Sikhs, in order to relieve their fellow-countrymen from the tyranny of that race. The leader of the Jihadis was Syed Ahmed, but he was no preacher. Moulavi Ismail was the man whose preaching worked marvels on the feelings of Mahomedans. Throughout the whole of his career, not a word was uttered

by this preacher calculated to incite the feelings of his co-religionists against the English. Once at Calcutta, whilst preaching the *jihad* against the Sikhs, he was interrogated as to his reasons for not proclaiming a religious war against the British, who were also infidels. In reply he said that, under the English rule, Mahomedans were not persecuted, and as they were the subjects of that Government, they were bound by their religion not to join in a *jihad* against it. At this time thousands of armed men and large stores of munitions of war were collected in India for the *jihad* against the Sikhs. Commissioners and Magistrates were aware of this and they reported the facts to Government. They were directed not to interfere, as the Government was of opinion that their object was not inimical to the British. In 1824, these Jihadis against the Sikhs reached the frontier, and they were afterwards continually strengthened by recruits and money from India. This was well-known to Government, and in proof of this, I will cite the following case:— A Hindu banker of Delhi, entrusted with money for the Wahabi cause on the frontier, embezzled the same, and a suit was brought against him before Mr. William Fraser, late Commissioner of Delhi. The suit was decided in favor of the plaintiff, Moulavi Ishak, and the money paid in by the defendant was forwarded to the frontier by other means. The case was afterwards appealed to the Sudder Court at Allahabad, but the decision of the Lower Court was upheld. At this time, the Wahabi cause prospered. With the aid of the frontier tribes, Peshawur was conquered, and was made over to Sultan Mohammad Khan, brother of the late Dost Mohammad Khan of Cabul. It was, however, soon after treacherously sold by him to Ranjeet Sinha.

During the second period the Wahabi cause waned. When Peshawur again fell into the hands of the Sikhs, numbers of the learned men amongst the followers of Syed Ahmed and Moulavi Ismail lost heart completely. They saw that the Pathan

tribes on the frontier hated them on account of their faith, that no help was therefore to be expected from them, and they saw that their own number was too small to cope successfully with the Sikhs. They therefore declared that they were no longer bound by their religion to continue the contest. A difference of opinion had also arisen amongst them as to the fitness of Syed Ahmed to be their leader—most of them declaring that he was unfit, whilst others maintained the contrary. Moulavi Ismail exerted himself to the utmost to allay these dissensions. He wrote a work, entitled *Mansab-i-Imamat*, which was published in Calcutta in the year 1265 Hijra (A. D 1849). All his efforts were, however, unavailing, and the band was broken up. Thousands returned to their homes in India, of whom the most noted were Moulavi Mahbub Ali, who died in 1864, and Moulavi Haji Mahomad. The latter was a resident of Lower Bengal, but he married at Delhi, and resided there for many years. He died at Alwar in 1870. It may interest my readers to learn that the above-named Mahbub Ali was the same man who in 1857, was summoned by the rebel leader, Bukht Khan and requested by him to sign the proclamation for a religious war against the English. He refused, and told Bukht Khan that the Mahomedan subjects of the British Government could not, according to the precepts of their religion, rise up in arms against their rulers. He moreover reproached him and his followers for the inhuman cruelties perpetrated by them towards the European ladies and children.

After this secession, Syed Ahmed's following was much reduced; and in 1831, he, with most of his adherents, was, through the treachery of Khadi Khan, slain in action against Shere Sinha. On their leader's death, the desertions from the cause were numerous. In order to prevent these, it was falsely given out that Syed Ahmed was alive, and had miraculously disappeared and hidden himself in a cave. This deception was, however, soon ex-

posed, and the followers of Syed Ahmed returned to their homes. After this period, the supplies of men and money, &c., in aid of the *jihad* ceased entirely from the N. W. Provinces. What occurred during the third period is not very interesting. I would here mention that Syed Ahmed, after the re-capture of Peshawur by the Sikhs, asked those of his followers, who were resolved to die with him for the cause, to make a solemn promise (*bayat-fil jihad*) to this effect. Several hundreds complied, and it is almost certain that only the few of those who survived the battle fought against Shere Sinha remained in the hills after the fall of their leader, Syed Ahmed. The majority of them were from Patna and other parts of Bengal. Moulavis Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali of Patna now became their leaders, but did nothing towards the furtherance of *jihad*. On the annexation of the Punjab by the British, they and most of their followers were despatched to their homes in 1847. Now, we have seen how recruits and money were forwarded from Patna and other parts of Bengal, and India generally, during the three first periods of frontier Wahabi history; but I think it is very evident that not a man of these was intended or used for an attack on British India, nor was there the slightest grounds for supposing during these three periods, that there was a rebellious spirit growing up amongst the general Mahomedan public in India. And yet Dr. Hunter maintains (page 79) that "about thirty years ago one of the Caliphs came on a missionary tour to Bengal, settled there, became trusted by all the neighbouring landed proprietors and preached *rebellion* with great force andunction." He also, says our author, "forwarded yearly supplies of men and money to the Propaganda at Patna for transmission to the frontier camp." Now this brings us back to the year 1841 or so, when several years had still to elapse before the Punjab was annexed by the British. Does Dr. Hunter really believe that men and money were forwarded at that time to enable the frontier people to attack the English? I think he will admit that a holy war against the Sikhs had been

going on for many years before the year 1841 ; and that it is but probable that the " men and money supplies" were intended for the defeat of the subjects of the Punjab rulers. I will now proceed to show that in the fourth period also there is no foundation for any suspicion whatever against my co-religionists in India. The English, who are unacquainted with the general run of Mahomedan opinion, will probably deem me an interested partisan, and will pay small attention to, or place little reliance upon, what I think and write. This, however, must not deter me from speaking what I know to be the truth. After the return to India of Moulavis Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali in 1847, there still remained a small remnant of Syed Ahmed's followers on the frontier. It is true that these two never slackened their efforts to induce men of Patna and the vicinity to join in the *jihad* and to collect money for the purpose. They were indefatigable, and in 1851, they showed what was still their leading idea by again leaving India for the frontier. Now Dr. Hunter has made out that it was with the intention of waging war with the British that they again resorted to the frontier, and that they thus transferred the *jihad* from the Sikhs to the British. Was this likely when they had no cause of complaint against the latter ? We have already seen in the oppression on Mahomedans by the Sikhs, what reason the former had for attacking the latter; but no reason has yet been shewn, either by Dr. Hunter or by any one else, for this sudden hatred to the British. No ; it was against the Sikhs in Jammu that their arms were directed. I have this from one who met these two Moulavis on their way to the frontier ; and I have no doubt of its truth. It must be borne in mind how very strict in their religion these Wahabis are. Stern fanatics, they never swerve aside from the principles of that faith. Now, those of whom I am writing had left their families and property in the care of the British Government, and their faith expressly forbids them taking up arms against the protectors of their families. Had they fought and died in battle against the English,

they would have been deprived of the joys of paradise and martyrdom, and would have been deemed sinners against their own religion. We have seen how small were the remnants of the Wahabi band on the frontier, and it has been shewn how hated they were by the hill tribes on account of their religious tenets. One feels inclined to smile when we read sentences like this in Dr. Hunter's book :—“The second minute of Lord Dalhousie had to deal with a proposition for a frontier war against the border tribes whose superstitious hatred to the infidel the Hindustani fanatics had again fanned to a red heat” (page 23). Our author forgets the very important fact that these mountain tribes have been turbulent from time immemorial; that they have never allowed any peace to any nation living on their frontiers, whether so-called infidels or Musalmans; that they fought indiscriminately with the Mahomedan Emperors of Delhi, and with the Sikhs in the Punjab. Like the Irishman at a fair, it mattered little to them who it was as long as it was some one to fight with. Even the great tyrant, Nadir Shah, whose name was feared throughout India, was never able to keep them in subjection. With regard to Wilayat Ali and Inayat Ali and their small following, nothing has ever transpired to shew that they ever conspired against the British power in India. On their death, which happened a few years after 1851, their followers all dispersed.

It is quite true that men and money were transmitted during the stay of these Moulavis on the frontier from Patna and other parts of Bengal; but no one believed that they were to be used against the British. It is not likely that a force so feeble could aspire to overturn the strong British Empire.

The fifth period of Indian Wahabi-ism has also, in my humble opinion, no connection whatever with *jihad*. I cannot believe that after the death of Wilayat Ali and Inayat Ali, men or money were forwarded to the frontier from Bengal in furtherance of a reli-

gious war. Since 1857, however, a band of desperate men, composed of mutineers and others—who, through the severe punishments meted out during the Mutiny, fled for their lives to those remote tracts—have taken up their abode at Mulka, Sittana, in the Nepal Terai, and in the deserts of Bikaneer and Rajputana. Those who fled to the N. W. Frontier were Hindus of all castes, as well as Mahomedans of different denominations ; and they instinctively collected together, fleeing, as they were, from a common danger. It was they, as mentioned above, who occupied Mulka and other places ; and to assert, as Dr. Hunter does, that they were there for the purpose of making a religious war against Government—composed, as their band was, of Hindus and Musalmans of all castes and denominations—is too absurd for belief. It is not unlikely, however, that many of these refugees were in communication with their homes in different parts of India, and it is very probable that they were assisted with sums of money by their relatives. A man, because he becomes an outlaw, does not necessarily forfeit the love of his relatives, nor do they feel it the less incumbent upon them to assist him by any means in their power. This has probably formed one of the bases upon which Dr. Hunter has constructed his edifice of a “regularly organized system of contributions of men and money in aid of a religious war against Government.” Another was probably the fact of money having found its way from India to the Akhoond of Swat. Now, my readers are probably all aware that every Mahomedan is bound, according to the precepts of his faith, to set apart at the end of each year, for the purpose of charity, one-fortieth part of his capital. This is termed *zakat*. Many, of course, do not act up to their religion, and decline to put their hands into their pockets to benefit others ; but all good Wahabis, and also all Mahomedans who have Wahabi proclivities, discharge this duty faithfully. The money thus set apart is paid by them to the poor of the neighbourhood, to travellers passing through their towns and villages, to Moulvis famed for their learn-

ing, to convents where pious men live in retirement, and to pupils residing in mosques, for their education. In distributing these alms, they can scarcely be required to find out all the recipient's antecedents; and so frightened have Mahomedans now become of being accused of aiding and abetting sedition, that in many cases men have abstained altogether from assisting travellers or any one else. Apparently, no Mahomedan can now dispense his "*zakut*" without laying himself open to the charge of aiding a *jihad* against the English. As regards the Akhoond of Swat, I have no doubt that he may have received portions of "*zakat*" from wealthy Mahomedans. He is, however, no Wahabi, and I can confidently assert that any sums which he may have received had no connection whatever with a *jihad* against the Indian Government. The school kept by Shah Abdul Azeez and the convent of Gulam Ali at Delhi received pecuniary aid from all parts of the world besides India, and one might just as well assert that they were aided for the purpose of waging *jihad*, as maintain that the Akhoond of Swat was subsidized for this purpose from India. Having thus given a *résumé* of the history of Indian Wahabi-ism, I would request my readers to bear the same in mind whilst accompanying me through the pages of Dr. Hunter's work. I think I have proved that the Indian Wahabi *jihad*—represented by our author to have been one against the British—was intended solely for the conquest of the Sikhs, and that, even although the band of mutineers at Mulka and Sittana may have given trouble to Government after 1857, the frontier colony, composed, as it was, of Hindus as well as Mahomedans, was scarcely one which could be designated as a *jihadi* community. On opening Dr. Hunter's book, in the very first page occurs the following sentence:—"For years a rebel colony has threatened our frontier, from time to time sending forth fanatic swarms, who have attacked our camps, burned our villages, murdered our subjects, and involved our troops in three costly wars." This is very pretty writing, enriched, as the sentence is, by the phrases

"rebel colony" and "fanatic swarms;" but the unprejudiced reader will at once ask "to whom does the author refer?" If he refers to the Wahabis, who settled there to wage *jihad* against the Sikhs, I have shewn how unfounded such an assertion would be; and if he means the band of mutineers—Hindus and Mahomedans—who fled from Hindustan during the Mutiny, what earthly connection have their raids with Dr. Hunter's question, "Our Indian Musalmans,—Are they bound in Conscience to Rebel against the Queen?"

Our author states (page 1):—"Successive State trials prove that a net work of conspiracy has spread itself over our provinces, and that the bleak mountains which rise beyond the Punjab are united by an unbroken chain of treason-depôts with the tropical swamps through which the Ganges merges into the sea. They disclose an organization which systematically levies money and men in the Delta, and forwards them by regular stages along our high roads to the rebel camp two thousand miles off. Men of keen intelligence and ample fortune have embarked in the plot, and a skilful system of remittances has reduced one of the most perilous enterprizes of treason to a safe operation of banking." This, taken in conjunction with his opening sentence, leads the reader to believe that this conspiracy was hatched by the Bengal Mahomedans with the more or less open concurrence of the whole Mahomedan community, with the object of subverting the English rule in India. Now, I think Dr. Hunter will allow that an organization can exist for other purposes than that of rebellion; and I think both Dr. Hunter and myself have shewn that an organization existed in India for the purpose of attacking the Sikhs. It is most unfair of him to insinuate that the organization in question was one inimical to our Indian Government, and thus to prejudice the minds of his readers against the whole of the Indian Musalmans. Again, at page 10, he writes:—"While the more fanatical of the Musalmans have thus engaged in overt sedition, the whole

Mahomedan community has been openly deliberating on their obligation to rebel... For some months the Anglo-Indian press was inclined to smile at the pains which the more loyal sort of the Musalmans were taking to ascertain whether they could abstain from rebellion without perdition to their souls." Now, I have no hesitation in saying that this is one of the most unjust, iliberal, and insulting sentences ever penned against my co-religionists. It is very evident that Dr. Hunter could have had but a most superficial knowledge of the state of Mahomedan feeling, and it shews how weak was the foundation upon which he built his so-called facts.

The causes which led to the Mahomedan deliberation and discussion were not those which Dr. Hunter asserts them to have been. The followers of Islam in India required no fresh teaching of the doctrines and obligations enjoined on them by their religion. They were well aware of them ; but the statements of ignorant men, and the injury which the propagation of such statements wrought on the prospects of the Indian Musalmans by biassing the minds of the English public against them, compelled them to come forward publicly to rectify their mistakes. At first, they were rather amused at the interpretations put upon their faith by some newspaper editors ; but when they found that matters were taking a serious turn, that their tenets were being perverted, and that accusations of disloyalty, and statements of the obligation of Mahomedans to be disloyal, were becoming more and more frequent, they deemed it necessary to issue the *futwas* alluded to. These are of no modern date. They have been in existence for hundreds of years, and have always been relied upon by Musalmans. At page 12, our author commences an account of the rebel camp on the frontier, and also gives an account of Syed Ahmed's career. Like those opposed to Wahabi-ism who jocularly called Syed "Abmed "the prophet," and said that he appointed four spiritual vice-regents (caliphs), Dr

Hunter also styles him by this name, and states that he appointed four caliphs (page 13). He also states, but has no authority for the statement, that "he appointed regular agents to go forth and collect a tax from the profits of trade in all the large towns which had lain on his route." At page 14 we find him writing the following sentence :—" Their avarice was enlisted, by splendid promises of plunder ; their religion, by the assurance that he was divinely commissioned to extirpate the whole Infidel world, from the Sikhs even unto the *Chinese*." Comparing this, however, with the Syed's exhortation to all Musalmans to join in a Holy War against the Sikhs, we find no mention made of the Chinese. Perhaps Dr. Hunter will favor us with his authority for this assertion about the Chinese. At page 15, our author writes that " troops from every discontented prince of northern India flocked to his camp." It would have been better had Dr. Hunter been a little more explicit in his meaning, as, from the foregoing, no one can tell who the princes were, nor why and with whom they were discontented. Having drawn on his imagination largely in his description of what took place in the Himalayas, our author treats us to a still greater flight of fancy in the following sentence :—" Two of the caliphs or vice-regents whom he appointed at Patna in 1821 made a pilgrimage to the frontier, and ascertained that their leader's disappearance was a miracle ; but that he was still alive, and would manifest himself in due time, at the head of a Holy Army, with which he would expel the English Infidels from India." This assertion is utterly wrong, and Dr. Hunter probably only thought it necessary to insert it as corroborative of his interpretation of the seventh doctrine of the Wahabi faith. He must have heard it from some one inimical to, and only too ready to bring a false charge against Wahabi-ism. It is unfortunate for Dr. Hunter that he has, throughout his work, relied upon very weak authorities when treating of Mahomedan creeds. The learned doctor has shewn little discretion in not sifting more carefully the chaff from the wheat. We come now to

a sentence which no Englishman, desirous of bridging over the gulf which separates our rulers from us, ought ever to have penned. He says:—"Every Mahomedan religionist, too zealous to live quietly under a Christian Government girded up his loins and made for the Sittana Camp." What an aspersion is this upon the whole Mahomedan community which remained quietly in India ! He does not seem to know what the Mahomedan, and still more the Wahabi, precepts enjoin on this subject ; or, knowing the same, he wilfully perverts their meaning. Wahabis act strictly up to the commands of the Prophet, and it is a well known fact that, during the Mahomedan persecution at Mecca, Mahomed himself ordered his staunchest followers to take refuge in the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia. To say, therefore, that zealous Mahomedans could not remain quietly in British territory, and that they felt themselves bound to repair to the frontier, is as untrue as it is uncalled for. Does Dr. Hunter mean to maintain that none of us Mahomedans who remained in India are good and zealous Musalmans ?

At page 23 Dr. Hunter corroborates my assertion that, the arms of the frontier Jihadis were not directed against the British. He says:—"In the same year (1852) they attacked our ally, the chief of the Amb state, and necessitated the despatch of a British force." He then goes on to say:—"I do not propose to trace in detail the insults, inroads, and murders which led to the frontier war of 1858. During the whole period the fanatics kept the border tribes in a state of chronic hostility to the British power." I should like to know what authority Dr. Hunter has for maintaining that the "chronic hostility" to the British was the work of "the fanatics." Strange that he should saddle this on them, considering that for centuries the border tribes had been fighting with the dwellers in the adjacent plains. I should say that they had quite sufficient inherent fighting proclivities to

render any such instigation unnecessary. Our author then states:— “During this time (1852-1857) the Sittana Colony, although stirring up a perpetual spirit of fanaticism along the frontier, had wisely avoided direct collision with our troops.” This carries out my assertion that the holy war against the Sikhs was not transferred to the British. Had it been so, I think my readers will allow that ten years would not have elapsed without a blow being struck against the British by the earnest men who, inflamed with holy zeal, so often fought hand to hand with the Sikhs. Dr. Hunter, however, quietly ignores this patent fact in order to make his tale sensational—to lend might to his title—“Our Indian Musalmans: Are they bound in conscience to rebel against the Queen?” We now come to the years 1857-58, 1861, and 1863. In 1857, Dr. Hunter states, the “Sittana Colony” tried to form a general coalition against us, and had the audacity to insist upon the British authorities aiding them in collecting their blackmail.” In a footnote he particularly notices the Yusafzai and Panjtar tribes as having been included in this coalition. I have no doubt but that the latter two tribes may, in 1857, have been very strongly tempted to attack British India, inasmuch as the Mutiny was going on, and the opportunity for a profitable raid was very tempting. Doubtless, many other tribes had also a hankering after the fleshpots of British India, and required no prompting from the “Sittana Colony.” It strikes one as rather strange that in 1858, only one year afterwards, the “Sittana Colony” should be on such bad terms with the whole of the frontier tribes as to be attacked by them, and to have their “fanatic leader” (Syed Umar Shah, *vide* footnote, page 25) slain. This shows, I think, that their influence amongst the mountain tribes could scarcely have been very great. As regards Dr. Hunter’s statement, that they were in the habit of levying tithes from the adjoining highland class (page 24), my opinion is that, after the death of Inayat Ali and Wilayat Ali, the few that remained of the old band were far too weak and divided amongst

themselves to attempt anything of the kind. During and after 1857, as has already been shewn, the Sittana Colony became the rendezvous of the sepoys and others, Hindus and Mahomedans who were expelled from India during the Mutiny. Now we have seen, according to our author himself (page 24), that from 1850 to 1857 not a single collision occurred between Dr. Hunter's "fanatics" and the British troops.

After 1857, however, the collisions are frequent. What is the inference to be drawn from this? I think there can be but one, *viz.*, that it was the Company's mutinous sepoys who were the instigators and actors in much that has occurred since that year. The Wahabis—*i. e.* the remnants of Syed Ahmed's band—had no hand in the raids nor is there the slightest foundation for Dr. Hunter's sweeping assertion, that the flames then kindled were nursed by the Mahomedan community in India. The border tribes had also a great deal to do with the many raids and cases of kidnapping, burning and plundering of British villages; but to lay all these atrocities at the door of Syed Ahmed's followers, and through them to implicate the whole of the Indian Musalmans, is monstrous in the extreme.

The remainder of Dr. Hunter's first chapter describes at length the Ambeyla campaign and the raid of 1868. As regards the opposition made by the hill clans in the former, I have only to remark—and this is borne out by British officers themselves on the spot—that they were not influenced by any love for the Mulka-host, but were justly incensed at the invasion of their territories without their permission. Had they had notice of our intention of advancing by the Ambeyla Pass, they would almost all have been on the side of the British. No intimation, however, of our plans was given them, and the suspicion engendered in their minds by such conduct made them range themselves on the side of the Sittana co-

lonists. Had the British been in the place of the border tribes, would they not have done likewise ?

At page 39, Dr. Hunter mentions three chiefs—*Mohammad Izak*, *Mohammad Yákub*, and *Moulvi Abdullá*; but he does not mention whence they came—from Patna, Lower Bengal, Northern India, or from any other part of the world. One would like to know whence these fire-brands emanated. I am unacquainted with their names, and, notwithstanding every effort, have hitherto failed in tracing them. Our author, whilst expressing the regret of the Punjab Government at its inability to drive out the Hindustani fanatics, or induce them to surrender and to return to their homes in Hindustan (pages 41-42), has very discreetly refrained from telling us whether this alluded to the mutineers of 1857 or to the remnants of Syed Ahmed's band. He would have finished the chapter with more *éclat* had he condescended to do this.

At page 45 of Dr. Hunter's work, we find a graphic account of a “professional wrestler and bully by name *Titu Miyán*,” whose agrarian outrages, in which the cows of Hindus are slaughtered (and in one instance the daughter of “a wealthy and obdurate *Musalman* forcibly married to the head of the band”) are mentioned by Dr. Hunter as the results of a Wahabi conspiracy to overturn the British rule. It is needless to attempt to refute so puerile an accusation. Outrages such as these have been only too common throughout Indian History, and can scarcely be looked upon as a *jiha'l* against the English.

The account of the mysterious disappearance of the “Prophet” (Syed Ahmed) has been slightly exaggerated by the learned Doctor. The general Mahomedan public were not so credulous as he would have us believe. I would, however, specially direct the reader's attention to the letter from “one of the most devoted Bengal missionaries,” in which the writer describes his discovery of the

imposition, and commands his followers to return to their homes. A very important inference to be drawn from this command is that this "fanatic missionary," as Dr. Hunter would style him, scorned an imposition as a means of fanning the religious zeal of his followers, and also that he had no intention of creating a disturbance in British territory. Dr. Hunter gives *in extenso* the history of Syed Ahmed and Abdool Wahab, and at page 61, says:—"Whatever was dreamy in his nature now gave place to a fiery ecstasy, in which he beheld himself planting the Crescent throughout every district of India, and the Cross buried beneath the carcases of the English Infidels." Syed Ahmed, or properly speaking Moulavi Ismail, certainly devoted all his energies to the reform of his faith in India—encrusted, as it had become, with formulas foreign to the original true faith. In this sense, therefore, Dr. Hunter is correct in his assertion as to his desire to have the Crescent planted in every district throughout India. The latter part of the sentence, however, is given by Dr. Hunter without quoting his authority, and is more than I can believe to be true. The summons, issued by Syed Ahmed to the Mahomedans in favor of a *jihad* against the Sikhs, completely refutes it. No Wahabi could have enunciated any such opinion, contrary, as it would have been, to the tenets of their faith; and I cannot but believe that here again has Dr. Hunter been misled by some person or persons inimical to Wahabi-ism.

In treating of the Wahabi literature, Dr. Hunter states that "throughout the whole literature of the sect this obligation (*jihad*) shines forth as the first duty of regenerate man." And again in page 66:—"But any attempt at even the briefest epitome of the Wahabi treatises in prose and verse on the duty to wage war against the English would fill a volume." He also gives the prophecies on the downfall of the British Banner, with a list of fourteen books, and quotes several passages from the same. These shall be referred to

presently, and Dr. Hunter's glaring blunders exposed. The question of religious war, and the conditions under which it becomes lawful or not, are treated of in all the books of the Mahomedan faith including the Holy Koran, the Hadis (sayings of the Prophet Mahomed), and Fikah (works on Mahomedan law). Dr. Hunter might, therefore, have informed the public that the obligation to *jihad* is prominently noticed in the whole Mahomedan literature, and not only in that of the Wahabis. When he maintains that *jihad* is the first duty of a Wahabi, he ought not in justice to have omitted to inform us under what condition it can be waged. Dr. Hunter further asserts that this sect has developed a copious literature relating to *jihad*. This is quite incorrect, and will be found to be so when we examine the books mentioned by our author. The first work named by him is *Sirat-ul-Mustakim*, written in 1223, Hijra or 1818 A. D., by Moulavi Mohammad Ismail of Delhi. In this the question of religious war is only treated of once, and this has been given—full of faults, however, in the rendering—by Dr. Hunter at page 64. The proper rendering is as follows:—“Holy war is a work of great profit; just as rain does good to mankind, beasts, and plants, so all persons partake of the advantages of *jihad* in several ways. The advantages of this great work are two-fold: general, of which spiritual beings—all men, even idolators and infidels, animals and vegetables—partake; special, of which some partake in one way and some in another. In connection with general advantages, it may be said that *accurate experience* has established that justness of rulers, conscientiousness of suitors, liberality of the rich, and the honesty of *all men in general*, are the causes of the blessings of Heaven, viz., copious showers at seasonable times, abundant supplies of vegetable produce, profit in the trade or business carried on by men, absence of danger and calamity, increase in the wealth of the people, and increase in the number of men of art and learning. All these advantages, increased a hundred-fold, are conferred upon men when the

dignity of the true faith is upheld, when the rank or position of the kings of the true faith is exalted, when their rule prevails in many countries, when the army of a king of the true faith is powerful, and when the laws of the true faith (*Shara*) are enforced and promulgated in these countries. But look at this country—India, as compared with Turkey and Tartary, as far as the blessings of Heaven are concerned. Nay, compare the present state of Hindustan in this year 1233 Hijra (A. D. 1818), when the greater portion of it has become *Dar-ul-Harb*, with the state of India some two or three centuries back, and contrast the blessings of Heaven now vouchsafed and the number of *learned and pious* men with those of that period." In addition to having translated this passage badly, Dr. Hunter has omitted altogether the phrase "accurate experience"—the very gist of the whole extract. Now Moulavi Ismail, while writing the foregoing, was treating generally of the subject of *jihad*, which is binding on all Mahomedans when the conditions under which it is to be waged exist. He alluded to no nation in particular—Sikh, Hindu, or English; and to extract a portion of the work, which, like all Mahomedan religious treatises, contains a chapter on *jihad*, and thereby to lead his readers to conclude that the extract in question was specially issued against the English, was most unfair of Dr. Hunter. In treating of the justness of rulers, conscientiousness of suitors, and liberality of the rich, Moulavi Ismail did not only imply the justness, &c., of Mahomedan rulers. He said that these qualities would be the source of Heaven's blessings to all those who possessed them—of whatever faith they might be. Dr. Hunter seizes on the comparison by Moulavi Ismail of the state of India in the nineteenth and seventeenth centuries as shewing an *animus* against the British Government. He has overlooked the fact that up to the middle of the eighteenth century, India was under a Mahomedan Government, which the Moulavi therefore condemns equally with that of 1818! Had the Moulavi lived in

the middle of last century, I scarcely think that he would have preached a *jihad* against his own Government. Dr. Hunter has also apparently overlooked the word *Dar-ul-Harb* (wrongly translated by him as "country of the enemy," which, according to his own showing, would prevent all good Musalmans from rebelling !

The following are extracts from the learned Doctor's own article in the *Englishman* of the 16th May 1871 :—

"We have shown that according to the authoritative Mahomedan texts, India has ceased to be a country of Islam, and become a country of the enemy (*Dar-ul Harb*)."

"It is a matter of no small importance, therefore, both to the more zealous of our Musalman subjects and to ourselves, that India is no longer *de jure* a country of Islam, and that the Mahomedans are therefore under no obligation to rise against us and make it a country of Islam *de facto* also."

"But we have abundantly proven, in our former articles, that India has ceased to be a country of Islam, and lapsed into a country of the enemy. The present generation of Musalmans are bound, according to their own texts, to accept the *status quo*. They are not responsible for it, and they are not bound, in the face of God's providence and the immense perils in which a revolt would involve the True Faith, to have recourse to arms."

Having thus shown that *Sirdat-ul-Mustakim*, the first of the 14 works with regard to which Dr. Hunter says (page 66)—"The mere titles of its (the Wahabi sect's) favorite works suffice to shew their almost uniformly treasonable character"—has no connection whatever with a *jihad* against Government, I will now say a few words as to the prophetic song given at pages 65 and 66, and to shew that Dr. Hunter is also in error as to its purport. This stanza, as also the poem by Moulavi Karam Ali of Cawnpur, was composed and circulated some time between 1824 and 1830, i. e.,

when Syed Ahmed was waging *jihad* against the Sikhs. It, as well as the other works which Dr. Hunter has introduced, certainly serves to embellish his book; but it fails to maintain or strengthen his arguments as to the obligation of the Mahomedans to rebel against the Queen, there being no single word in the translation of the verses to shew that they were intended to excite the followers of Islam against Government. My readers have only to remember the time of its promulgation to see to whom its exhortations refer; and I therefore leave it to their sense of fairness to judge whether the following sentence of Dr. Hunter's, which immediately succeeds this poem (page 66), is true or not:—"But any attempt at even the briefest epitome of the Wahabi treatises in prose and verse on the duty to wage war against the English would fill a volume."

The third work named by our author is *Shir-i-Wikāyat*. An Arabic work of this name, written some hundreds of years ago, and containing doctrines of the Hanafi church, is known to me as well as to the rest of the Mahomedan world. It may be a favorite work of the Wahabis, but it was in existence long before the development of that sect in India; and it inculcates, as the Doctor himself admits, (foot note 3, page 66), holy war only when the Infidel oppresses the true Believers.

The fourth work, *viz.*, *Prophetic Poem*, foretelling the downfall of the British power, and a few more prophecies at page 63, were first published by Saint Vāli Nyamut Ullah, a dervish of Cashmere, who died in 1028 Hijra, or 1618 A. D. In his description of the principal tenets of the Wahabi faith, our author states that they do not recognize saints as possessing any supernatural powers. Strange, therefore, that he should maintain that they place any reliance in the poem alluded to. Even Mahomedans, who worship saint's graves, regard their sayings as unreliable. Such verses are generally written by astrologers and by men pretending to a know-

ledge of Ramal and Jafar. We find at the same time good men also enunciating such prophecies with, however, no evil intentions. Christian clergymen, as my readers will allow, sometimes determine the end of the world, the downfall of France, Turkey, &c.—basing their prophecies on the revelation of St. John. I think, however, that men possessing even a small modicum of common sense will smile at such prophecies, and will scarcely put much faith in them. Wahabis believe in no prophecy. Their faith teaches them that no man, not even Muhammad himself, had any knowledge of futurity—*vide* the following verse, 188, 7th Chapter of the Holy Koran:—“ Say (ye Mahomet) I am able neither to procure advantage unto myself, nor to avert mischief *from me* but as God pleaseth. If I knew the secrets of God, I should surely enjoy abundance of good, neither should evil befall me. Verily I am no other than a denouncer of threats, and a messenger of good tidings unto people who believe.”

The fifth work, *Tawárikh-i-Kaiser-i-Rúm*, has also no connection whatever with Wahabi literature. It is an historical work written in Arabic by Ibráhim Effendi, in the service of the Turkish Government. An abstract of the above work was published in Persian at Cawnpore in 1821 Hijra (1864 A. D.), and contains, amongst other matters, an account of the battles fought between the Wahabis and the Turks in the reign of Sultan Mahmood I.

With reference to the sixth work, *Asár-i-Mahshar*, written by Moulavi Muhammad Ali, our author says:—“ It foretells a war in the *Khyber Hills on the Punjab frontier*, where the English will first vanquish the Faithful, whereupon the Mahomedans will make search for their true Imam. Then there will be a battle lasting four days, ending in the complete overthrow of the English, ‘ even the very smell of Government being driven out of their heads and brains.’ Thereafter the Imam Mahdi will appear, and the Mahomedans, being now the rulers of India, will flock to meet him at Mecca.

These events will be heralded in by an eclipse both of the sun and moon in the month of Ramzán." Now, I frankly confess that I am at a loss what to think of Dr. Hunter. I can scarcely believe that he intended to deceive or mislead his readers ; but at the same time, I can hardly credit him with such gross ignorance as is here evinced. Either one or the other ~~s~~supposition is the correct one, so that Dr. Hunter stands convicted either of intentionally misleading the public or of "ignorance profound." I will now give a summary of the work, merely begging my readers to bear in mind the fact that the "Khyber Hills on our Punjab frontier" of Dr. Hunter are hills of the same name situated near Medina ! The following is my summary which may be relied upon as correct :—

"About the end of the world, there will be a war between the Sultan of Turkey and a Christian King. Two Christian Kings will assist the Sultan (just as the late Sultan was helped in the Crimean campaign). After a war of varying success in the plains of Syria, the Sultan will, at last, aided by his Christian allies, come off victorious. After this, a dispute will arise between the troops of the Sultan and those of his Christian allies for the glory of the triumph ; the latter will claim it as the victory of the Cross, while the former will claim it as the triumph of Islam. The dispute will at length end in the fall of the Sultan, and in the alliance of the three Christian chiefs, *viz.*, the two allies and the opponent of the Sultan. These three allies will occupy the whole of the Turkish Empire, and will then extend their dominion as far as the *Khyber Hills near Medina*. When events have arrived at this point, Mahomedans, supposing that the time for the fulfilment of the prophecy regarding the advent of Imam Mahdi is nigh, will search for him. He will be at Medina at the time, but will soon after go to Mecca where they will all flock to him. Shortly after, a chief of Khorasan*

* *Vide* page 63, and compare this fact with Dr. Hunter's fourth line in page 63 :—"Had not Mohamud himself said, 'When you see the black flags coming from Khorasan, go forth, for with them is a Caliph, the Envoy of God.'

will also march out of his country to visit him in that Holy City. The Imam will then collect a force with which he will defeat the Christians, and will establish the faith and kingdom of Islam throughout the greater portion of the world. After this, Anti-Christ is to appear, and to try to vanquish the Imam ; but in the meantime Christ will descend from heaven, in the mosque of Damascus, and lending his assistance to Imam Mahdi, they will both subvert Anti-Christ's power. Several other events of minor importance are afterwards to take place, and at last the world will come to an end." So much for Dr. Hunter's "Khyber Hills." In concluding my remarks on this work, I would remark that its contents are regarded by Musalmans in general as mere traditions. Learned Mahomedan divines have no faith in them, and I deem them as true as any modern sensational novel.

THE seventh work mentioned by Dr. Hunter is *Takwiat-ul-Imán*. An English translation of this work was published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Vol. 13 of 1852. Every Englishman can read this work for himself ; a perusal of a few pages will show how little connection it has with Wahabi-ism and *jihad*. The eighth work is *Tazkirat-ul-Akhawi*. I am unacquainted with this work, nor did I ever hear that Moulavi Ismail of Delhi wrote such a work. From its title, it appears to be a book containing useful and instructive matter. The ninth work, *Nasihat-ul-Musalmín*, consists of five chapters. The first chapter describes Paganism ; the second, the impudence and foolishness of Pagans ; the third shows that, to worship any created thing as god is Paganism ; the fourth describes the customs of Mahomedan Pagans ; and the fifth, the punishment ordained by God to Pagans. Throughout the work, I, however, find no passage which could be regarded as likely to instigate even to wage holy war against Government. The tenth work is *Hidayat-ul-Mumintin*. I know only one book of this name, and it treats of *Táziadári*. The eleventh on the list is an Arabic work, *Tanwír-ul-Ainain*, which

was printed in Calcutta with an Urdu translation. It says not a single word regarding holy-war, and merely contains discussions as to whether both hands should be lifted up on a certain occasion during prayer, or not. The full title of the work is *Tanwîr-ul-Ainain fi-isbât-i-rafi-il Yâdaîn*, which signifies "light of the eyes to show or prove that both hands should be raised during prayer." Why Dr. Hunter should associate this work with *jihad* is more than I can comprehend. The twelfth, *Akdul Jid*, is a work written long before the existence of Syed Ahmed and Moulavi Ismail, by Moulavi Shah Wali-ullah, grandfather of Moulavi Ismail, who died in 1174 Hijra, or 1760 A. D. It also treats nowhere of *jihad*, and simply discusses the doctrine whether man should follow the dictates of his own reason and understanding in matters of religion, or should follow implicitly the learned men who have lived before him. The full name of this work is *Akdul-Jid fi Ahkâmil Ijtihâd-i-vat-taklîd*. It appears, the learned Doctor has mistaken the word *Ijtihâd*, which means "to use one's own reason and understanding," for *jihad*, and consequently falls into the error of supposing that it relates to entering on religious war! The thirteenth, is *Tambihul-Ghâflîn*, in Urdu. It is a small treatise written by Syed Ahmed for his followers and other Mahomedans. In the introductory part of the book, he speaks of the transitoriness of this world, and exhorts men to avoid its temptations to the utmost of their ability. In the body of the book, he interdicts his followers from worshipping any created thing as they would worship the Almighty God. Not a single word regarding *jihad* will be found in it. With regard to the fourteenth work, *Arbâin* or. *Chihil Hadîs*, I have only to remark that, we find many such selections of forty verses from the sayings of Prophet Mahomet, not recently compiled and published; but I have never hitherto met with any that was ever compiled by a Wahabi or that contained instigations to *jihad*.

I now come to the so-called Wahabi Sermon for *Hijrat* as given by Dr. Hunter at page 70 of his work. The first portion of the Sermon is taken from the *Calcutta Review*, Chapter 11, page 393; and the second, from *Jáma-i-Tafáser*. An English translation of the latter is, however, given at page 391 of the abovementioned number of the *Calcutta Review*. As regards the first para. of the Sermon, the writer of the *Calcutta Review* article cites no authority for his quotation. The second para., taken from the *Jáma-i-Tafáser*, has suffered at the hands of the translator, as will be seen in the sequel. The author of the *Jáma-i-Tafáser*, in the passage above referred to, comments on the 10th verse, chapter 39, of the Holy Koran, which runs thus:—"Say, O my servants who believe, fear your Lord. They who are good in this world shall obtain good in the next; and God's earth is spacious: verily those who persevere with patience shall receive their recompense without measure." The author of the *Jáma-i-Tafáser*, concurring with the opinion of other commentators, says that the phrase "God's earth is spacious," alludes to the Prophet's command to his true followers, who were oppressed at Mecca, to flee for refuge in Abyssinia, then governed by a Christian king. To this succeeds the passage the purport of which is given in the second para. of Dr. Hunter's Sermon. The word "strangled" is not the correct equivalent for the word used in the original. The passage in the original simply means—"If we speak the truth, we are stifled and opposed by the people, *viz.*, *Musalmans*, who are inimical to Wahabi-ism." In a foot-note of his work, the abovenamed author prays God to grant His graces, so that he may die in Mecca or Medina, and that his bones may lie there, as, by the favour of God, his teacher, Moulavi Ishak, died and was buried in one of the holy cities. I think my readers will allow that a man in whose heart the religious element predominates, whatever be his faith or creed, invariably longs for such things, and exhorts others to do likewise. Let us quote the words of the same writer in the *Calcutta Review*—words which Dr. Hunter has wisely omitted:

—“ The doctrine of Hijrat is not peculiar to the religion of Islam, but is common to it and Christianity. The pilgrim, the Crusader who aspired to lay their bones in Jerusalem, the Roman Catholic who desired to spend his last days in Rome, have all been actuated by the same motive—to pass the closing days of their life in some holy place in which the probability of temptation to sin is diminished.” Were the latter doctrine (Hijrat) true as regards India, Dr. Hunter would soon be relieved of the presence of the Musalmans whom he styles seditious and dangerous to Government.

We now come to the third part of the fourfold organization, *viz.*, Local Wahabi Missionaries, treated of by Dr. Hunter (pages 71-75). I leave my readers to judge from the following two sentences what dependence is to be placed on Dr. Hunter’s opinion :—“ And I should be very sorry if I were supposed to use the term Wahabi as a *synonym for traitor*” (page 72). “ It is one of the misfortunes attendant on the British rule in India that this reformation should be inseparably linked with hatred against the Infide conquerors. But everywhere any attempt by the Mahomedans to return to the first principles of their faith *involves a revolt against the ruling power*” (page 75.) Our author cannot be consistent for even five pages. More than this however, he brings a charge against the religion of Islam, which, from all that I have proved, is totally unfounded. His mind is so full of his fancied Wahabi conspiracy and *jihad*, that he turns and twists everything connected with Mahomedism in support of his cherished theories. Whilst, however, maintaining that Wahabi-ism is quite opposed to the doctrine laid down in Dr. Hunter’s last-quoted sentence, I grant that there are some bigotted and superstitious Wahabis, who look with hatred and contempt not only on Infidels, but also on all Mahomedans who do not profess the same faith as themselves. Mahomedans of other churches, even the *Ahul-i-Sunnat* and *Jamiat*, to which Church these Wahabis themselves belong, and also those who are not in their eyes orthodox Wahabis, are all equally reck-

oned without the pale. To visit such, to sit in their company, to join in their feasts, to sympathize with them in their joys and sorrows—nay, even to read prayers along with them—are alike distasteful to these bigots. They are in fact the *ne plus ultra* of Dissenters. Their opinions are not, however, infallible ; their acts and thoughts are their own ; they represent no principle of Wahabi-ism. Dr. Hunter is not apparently aware of the existence of many earnest Wahabis, as also men who, though no Wahabis, have Wahabi tendencies, who are desirous that as the Wahabi faith is pure as regards God, so it may be as regards men ; that mutual love may reign throughout the earth ; and that as their faith inculcates the unity of God, it may also be the means of promoting brotherhood amongst the human race. That there are such men, and that their example will be powerful for good, is undoubted. Having admitted then, that there are certain Wahabis whose faults are great, and whose ways are opposed to the ordinances of God and His Prophet, I cannot admit that Dr. Hunter's assertion that, the reformation of the Musalman faith is inseparably linked with hatred against the Infidel conquerors, is in the slightest degree correct. I am perfectly certain in my own mind that the purification of our faith and our loyalty to the Government under whom we live and serve are perfectly compatible. At page 78, Dr. Hunter treats us to a description of the fourth part of the Wahabi organization, and mentions the existence of traitor settlements or district centres for the levying of men and money for treasonable purposes, and for the appropriation of all offerings to caliphs in furtherance of a holy War. The following sentence occurs at page 82 :—“ He commanded every head of a family to put aside a handful of rice for each member of his household at every meal.” I cannot help thinking that Dr. Hunter is describing an ideal race, whose standard of civilization and whose patriotism have never yet been equalled in this world. Strength and firmness of mind, forethought, unity of purpose, reticence and secrecy, extraordinary skill in governing

the minds of masses, without which an organization, such as Dr. Hunter ascribes to the Indian Wahabis, could never have existed a week, have long been forgotten by the people of India. Even in the histories of Greece and Rome, whose patriots were numerous as the sands of the sea, we fail to find such rare patriotism and unity of purpose as are here described. The real facts of the matter are that an organization, clumsy and perfectly known to Government, existed long ago (*vide* Dr. Hunter's page 79)—not for rebellion, as Dr. Hunter makes out, but for the *jihad* against the Sikhs; and out of this, Dr. Hunter has built up the edifice, which fortunately, owing to the good sense and fairness of the English race, has now fallen to the ground. In the concluding part of the second chapter, Dr. Hunter gives an account of the State trials in connection with the Wahabi conspiracy. It is not for me to make any remarks upon their results. The time will come perhaps when the real truth will be known.

IN the commencement of the third chapter, we find little more than a triumph of our author's literary* skill, and sentence after sentence of masterly composition. The subject-matter is scarcely worthy the trouble bestowed upon it by Dr. Hunter. Further on, he treats of the *futwas* relating to *jihad* against the Queen, which have been published in India during the past few years, and describes the motives of the Mahomedans in issuing them in his usual imaginative manner. As I have already given the true motives which actuated the Mahomedan community in this important matter, I will say no more about it here. Dr. Hunter then proceeds to a consideration of the Shia sect; and although he afterwards qualifies (page 19) the panegyric which he passes upon them, I am glad to see that the learned Doctor approves of a portion at least of one of the sects of the Indian Mahomedan community. Let us be thankful for small mercies. He then goes on to prove with great acumen and ability that India has now lapsed into *Dar-ul-Harb*, refuting at the same time with equal

skill, the decision arrived at by the Calcutta Mahomedan Literary Society, *viz.*, that Hindustan is still a *Dar-ul-Islam*. If the Calcutta Mahomedan Literary Society mean that India is *Dar-ul-Islam* in the primary signification of the word, I concur with Dr. Hunter in the arguments he has given to disprove the decision of that learned Society; but if the Society call India *Dar-ul-Islam* in the secondary meaning of the word, I am at one with them in their decision. It is a great mistake to suppose that a country can only be either a *Dar-ul-Islam* or a *Dar-ul-Harb* in the primary signification of the words, and that there is no intermediate position. A true *Dar-ul-Islam* is a country which, under no circumstances, can be termed a *Dar-ul-Harb*, and *vice Versa*. There are, however, certain countries which, with reference to certain circumstances, can be termed *Dar-ul-Islam*, and with reference to others, *Dar-ul-Harb*. Such a country is India at the present moment. My first article on *jihad* was published in a pamphlet, entitled "An Account of the Loyal Mahomedans of India, No. II.," printed at Meerut in 1860; the second and third articles on the same subject appearing in the *Pioneer* of the 4th and 14th April 1871, and the fourth, in the *Allygurh Institute Gazette* of 12th May 1871. A most able article on Dr. Hunter's work which appeared in the *Pioneer* of the 23rd November 1871, has well nigh exhausted the subject of *jihad*; but as there are one or two serious errors committed by Dr. Hunter which have still to be refuted, I will now refer to them as briefly as possible. At page 128, he says,—"The Wahabis start with the declaration that India has become a country of the enemy, and from this they deduce the obligation of Holy War against its rulers;" and again at page 140, he repeats the same assertion in the following words:—"The Wahabis, whose zeal is greater than their knowledge, deduce from the fact of India being technically a country of the enemy the obligation to wage war upon its rulers." This is a perfectly groundless charge against the

sect who, from the very fact of India having become *Dar-ul-Harb*, deemed *jihad* against Government unlawful. They therefore never waged war against it, not even during the great Mutiny of 1857. If Dr. Hunter still maintains that he is right in the foregoing assertions, I would ask him to give us any authority shewing that the Wahabis have ever declared *jihad* against the British in India to be lawful. The Mahomedan doctors of Mecca are the next to whom our author applies the rod. At page 123, he writes:—"Still more significantly, the two most important decisions, that of the Mecca doctors and of Moulavi Abdul Hai, confine themselves to affirming that India is a country of Islam, and *most carefully avoid drawing the inference that rebellion is therefore unlawful*:" and again at page 130, he says,—"I therefore view with extreme suspicion the decision of the doctors at Mecca—that stronghold of fanaticism and intolerant zeal—when they declare that India is a country of Islam, but who, instead of deducing therefrom, as the Calcutta Mahomedan Literary Society infer, that rebellion is therefore unlawful, leave it to their Indian co-religionists to draw the opposite conclusion, namely, that rebellion is therefore incumbent." I cannot see how this accusation can hold, as, if we refer to the question asked them, as given in Dr. Hunter's appendix, we find that they were never consulted as to the lawfulness or otherwise of *jihad* in India! Why should they give a reply to what they were never asked? The inference drawn by Dr. Hunter is very unfair. At page 136, he writes that, "India passed from a country of Islam into a country of the enemy by absolutely imperceptible gradations." The first step taken by the British Government, according to Dr. Hunter, towards the conversion of the country into *Dar-ul-Harb*, was that they imperceptibly got rid of the subordinate Mahomedan Governors; the second, the impression of British sovereigns' effigy on Indian coins; the third, the abolition of Mahomedan procedure; and the fourth and last, the dismissal of the Mahomedan law-officers (Kazis) under Act XI.

of 1864. Now, I disagree again with Dr. Hunter. My readers are probably aware that those who call India *Dar-ul-Harb*, reckon it as such from the battle of Plassey. To convert a country from *Dar-ul-Islam* into *Dar-ul-Harb*, it is sufficient that its Infidel rulers are possessed of power to act according to their pleasure: whether they do act or not is a quite different thing. Dr. Hunter seems here to forget what Shah Abdul Aziz has said in his *futwa*, cited by the author in page 140, wherein the eminent Moulavi clearly says that, "when the power of the Infidels increases to such an extent that they can abolish or retain the ordinance of Islam according to their pleasure, such a country is politically a country of the enemy (*Dar-ul-Harb*)."¹ He also forgets the important fact that Shah Abdul Aziz gave out this *futwa*, declaring India *Dar-ul-Harb*, during his life-time, some fifty years ago, when none of the changes, owing to which Dr. Hunter says India became *Dar-ul-Harb* had taken place! Another mistake that deserves special notice lurks in the Doctor's assertion (page 141):—"The more enlightened Musalmans, while sorrowfully accepting the fact, regard it, not as a ground of rebellion, but as a curtailment to their spiritual privileges." The author goes so far as to assert that many of the devout Mahomedans even refrain from reading Friday prayers in India, and in proof of this, quotes two names—Moulavi Mahomed Wajih, Professor of the Calcutta Mahomedan College, and the Kázi-ul-Kuzát Fazl-ul-Rahmán,—who, he says, had given up reading Friday prayer because India had lapsed into *Dar-ul-Harb*. Now, staunch and zealous Wahabis require only one condition to make Friday prayer incumbent, viz., an assembly of at least three Mahomedans; the Sháfai Church requires an assembly of at least forty Mahomedans. The followers of the Hanafi Church, however, are far more particular, and certain conditions and restrictions are requisite before Friday prayer is incumbent on them. Even in *Dar-ul-Islam*, should those conditions not exist, they would not read the usual Friday

prayer. The two gentlemen named by our author belonged to the Hanafi Church, and in their opinion, the necessary conditions did not exist. It is therefore scarcely fair to assert that they discontinued their Friday prayer merely because India was *Dar-ul-Harb*.

Towards the end of the third chapter, Dr. Hunter says that he has no hope of enthusiastic loyalty and friendship from the Mahomedans of India ; the utmost he can expect from them is a cold acquiescence in British rule. If our author is so hopeless on account of our faith being that of Islam, let me commend to his attention the 85th verse, Chapter V., of the Holy Koran (George Sale's translation) :—“ Thou shalt surely find the most violent of all men in enmity against the true believers to be the Jews and the idolators : and thou shalt surely find those among them to be the most inclinable to entertain friendship for true believers who say we are Christians. This cometh to pass because there are priests and monks among them, and because they are not exalted with pride.” Like begets like ; and if cold acquiescence is all that Mahomedans receive at the hands of the ruling race, Dr. Hunter must not be surprised at the cold acquiescence of the Mahomedan community. Let us both—Christians and Mahomedans—remember and act up to the words of Jesus Christ—“ Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them : for this is the law and the Prophets.” (Matthew, Chapter VII., verse 12.) . . .

At the end of the chapter (foot-note 1) Dr. Hunter would put the following, to him, crucial, question to the Mahomedan community :—

Question.—“ Learned men and expounders of the law of Islam ! what is your opinion in the following matter ?—

In case of a Mahomedan ruler attacking India while in the pos-

session of the English, is it the duty of the Mahomedans of that country to renounce the *Aman* of the English, and render help to the invader?"

Before answering this question, which I shall do, I trust, perfectly to the learned Doctor's satisfaction, I will quote several passages bearing on *jihad*. It is as well to have them before us before giving him the answer.

"According to Islam, the best and the most meritorious act is the preaching and making generally known the existence of an invisible God. It could hardly be expected that, in the infidel countries, there could be sufficient personal security for such Moslems who might choose to inculcate by precept, exhort by preaching, and practise openly the worship of the unity of God; and therefore appeal was at once made to the sword in order to establish the superiority of the Moslem power, and to insure security and tranquillity for such Mahomedans as might choose to preach wholesome doctrine of their faith, and to live in peace in those countries; so that their habits, conduct, and manner of living might serve as example for the unbelievers. The effect so desirable, *viz.*, that the Moslems might live in peace and preach the worship of the one only true God, was only attainable by one of these ways—*first*, the voluntary conversion of the people; *second*, the establishment of peace and security by alliances, offensive and defensive; and *third*, by conquest. As soon as the desired object was secured, the sword was immediately sheathed. If tranquillity was established by either of the two last methods, the parties had no authority to interfere with the religious observances of the subject or of each other; and every person was at liberty to observe, unmolested by any one, all the ceremonies and rites, whatever they might be, of his creed."—*Vide my Essays on the Life of Muhammad*, page 30.

From this, it is evident that as long as Musalmans can preach

the unity of God in perfect peace, no Musalman can, according to his religion, wage war against the rulers of that country, of whatever creed they be. Next to the Holy Koran, the most authoritative and favourite works of the Wahabis are *Bokhári* and *Muslim*, and both of them say—"When our Prophet Muhammad marched against any infidel people to wage holy war upon them, he stopped the commencement of hostilities till morning, in order to find out whether the Azan (call for prayer) was being called in the adjacent country. If so, he never fought with its inhabitants." His motive for this was that, from hearing the Azan, he (the prophet) could at once ascertain whether the Moslems of the place could discharge their religious duties and ceremonies openly and without molestation. Now we Mahomedans of India live in this country with every sort of religious liberty ; we discharge the duties of our faith with perfect freedom ; we read our Azans as loud as we wish ; we can preach our faith on the public roads and thoroughfares as freely as Christian missionaries preach theirs ; we fearlessly write and publish our answers to the charges laid against Islam by the Christian clergy ; and even publish works against the Christian faith ; and last, though not least, we make converts of Christians to Islam without fear or prohibition.

My reply to Dr. Hunter's question is therefore that in no case would it be the *religious* duty of any Mahomedan to renounce the Aman of the English, and render help to the invader. Should they do so, they would be regarded as sinners against their faith, as they would then break that holy covenant which binds subjects to their rulers, and which it is the duty of the former to keep sacred to the last. I cannot, however, predict what the actual conduct of the Musalmans would be in the event of an invasion of India by a Mahomedan or any other power. He would be a bold man indeed who would answer for more than his intimate

friends and relations, perhaps not even for them. The civil wars in England saw fathers fighting against sons, and brothers against brothers; and no one can tell what the conduct of a whole community would be in any great political convulsion. I have no doubt, but that the Musalmans would do what their political status—favorable or the contrary—would prompt them to do. I think Dr. Hunter's crucial question might be put to the Hindu as well as to the Mahomedan community. It would be but fair to both parties.

The fourth chapter of Dr. Hunter's work deals with a most interesting subject, but it is to be regretted that it contains little that is really practical, or really useful, to the Mahomedan community or to the Government of India. I will confine my remarks to a few of the points touched upon by our author. At page 144, he says:—"The powers of arrest granted by the Legislature to the Executive enable the Government to deal with the evil. The ringleaders suffer the penalty of personal restraint, without obtaining the glory of a public appearance on behalf of their faith. Even those who are sentenced to transportation for life by the courts are treated with contemptuous leniency by the Government, being generally returned in a few years to the Mahomedan community as apostates to the Wahabi cause." Unfortunately, Dr. Hunter ignores two natural and most important political principles:—1st.—That it is a recognized law that the more a sect is persecuted on account of its faith, the more tenaciously will its members cling to it. Had not the Christian faith suffered as it did in its earlier days, it would never have reached the high pinnacle upon which it is now established. Had Islam not been persecuted at Mecca, it would never have been the religion of the many millions now followers of Muhammad, the Prophet of God. Dr. Hunter's assertion that the Musalmans, who are once transported, return from banishment, apostates to the Wahabi cause, is, therefore, let me assure him, in the highest degree incorrect.

2ndly.—As it is in the interests of Government that the really guilty only should be punished, it is equally a grave political error to punish those who are regarded as innocent. The more a Government blunders in this respect, the more it gives cause to its enemies to triumph. Unjust and indiscriminate punishment not only inflames and exasperates the minds of the seditious, but also grieves and alienates those who are its true well-wishers. At page 145, Dr. Hunter says:—“ For there is no use shutting our ears to the fact that the Indian Mahomedans arraign us on a list of charges as serious as have ever been brought against a Government. They accuse us of having closed every honorable walk of life to professors of their creed. They accuse us of having introduced a system of education which leaves their whole community unprovided for, and which has landed it in contempt and beggary. They accuse us of having brought misery into thousands of families, by abolishing their law-officers, who gave the sanction of religion to the marriage-tie, and who, from time immemorial, have been the depositaries and administrators of the Domestic Law of Islam. They accuse us of imperilling their souls by denying them the means of performing the duties of their faith. Above all, they charge us with deliberate malversation of their religious foundations, and with misappropriation on the largest scale of their religious funds.” It is not unreasonable that a certain portion of the Mahomedan community should bring such charges against Government; but enlightened Mahomedans are perfectly aware that they cannot expect the same regard for their customs and for their system of education from a foreign Government, as they enjoyed under rulers of their own faith. Let us just recall what our conduct was when we Mahomedans held sway in Spain, and when we first conquered India. Spaniards and Hindus would have been glad to possess a moiety of the benefits which we, in common with the Hindus, enjoy under the present rulers of India. The abolition of the offices of Kazis, who gave religious sanction to

the marriage-tie, was, with regard to the political status of the present century, a grave political error. It interfered, however, in no way with our faith, though the uneducated opined it did. According to Islam, marriage is simply a contract of union for life between man and woman. In some cases, the presence of two witnesses is deemed necessary, but not the presence of the Kazi or any priest. The Kazis of India were, as perhaps our author is not aware of, the most illiterate class of men, and the better class of Mahomedans had but little respect for them. If our Government has abused our religious foundations and misappropriated our educational funds, it is fortunate for us that the law sanctions our arraigning it before its own courts of justice. Thank God! this course is always open to us. Again at page 145, Dr. Hunter says:—"They (Mahomedans) accuse us of imperilling their souls by denying them the means of performing the duties of their faith." I do not perceive his meaning. If he allude to the Government interference in the matter of Musalman holiday festivals, as mentioned at pages 187-88, I disagree with him. In no place in British India are such festivals disallowed to Mahomedans.

Dr. Hunter then describes at length the causes which have impoverished the Mahomedan community, and accuses Government of neglecting to educate that portion of its Indian subjects. I cannot hold Government wholly responsible for this. He says (page 174) that Mahomedans do not avail themselves of the Government system of education—"because, " the truth is that our system of public instruction, which has awakened the Hindus from the sleep of centuries, and quickened their inert masses with some of the noble impulses of a nation, is opposed to the traditions, unsuited to the requirements, and hateful to the religion of the Musalmans." There is a good deal of truth in this sentence; and I only join issue with Dr. Hunter on the last clause, *viz.*, that the system is regarded as "hateful to the religion of the Musalmans." Dr.

Hunter connects this with disaffection and disloyalty to Government; but as this is only his own opinion, I meet it with mine, and maintain that he is mistaken. As regards the present system of education, so eagerly embraced by the Hindus, but so repugnant to the ideas of Mahomedans, it must be borne in mind how wide is the difference between the two races. There are numerous classes of Hindus who are never in the habit of discussing the doctrines of their faith. They, therefore, had no objection to be educated in that which was even opposed to it. Mahomedans are, however, bound to know all the tenets of their faith, to discuss them, and to regulate their lives accordingly. It is on this account that they have hitherto refrained from availing themselves of an education taught through the medium of a foreign tongue, and which they therefore deem opposed to their belief. All history proves that the introduction of new theories, opposed to any established belief, was invariably regarded with suspicion and contempt. Socrates was condemned by his idolatrous fellow-countymen to die for his belief in one god. The Copernican system was once hateful to many Christians, and those who embraced its doctrines were sometimes visited with capital punishment. Luther's was not a bed of roses. When Mahomedans adopted the Greek system of philosophy, many were the anathemas of the faithful. The theory of geologists of the earth being older than it is stated to be in the Bible, raised a storm of indignation amongst orthodox Christians. The present age is one of progress, but Rome was not built in a day. It is not to be expected that Mahomedans, who are made of much sterner material than Hindus, will adapt themselves so readily to the various phases of this changing age. Let us have time, let us live, work, and wait. There are many reformers now at work, a fact which Dr. Hunter does not, however, appear to be aware of. The system which Dr. Hunter recommends for the education of Mahomedans does not commend itself to me, nor do I think it to be practicable. The object which he aims at will never

be obtained by Government interference, but will certainly come to pass by our own exertions. At page 210, Dr. Hunter writes:— “We should thus at length have the Mahomedan youth educated upon our own plan. Without interfering in any way with their religion, and in the very process of enabling them to learn their religious duties, we should render that religion perhaps less sincere, but certainly less fanatical. The rising generation of Mahomedans would tread the steps which have conducted the Hindus, not long ago the most bigoted nation upon earth, into their present state of easy tolerance. Such a tolerance implies a less earnest belief than their fathers had, but it has freed them, as it would liberate the Musalmans, from the cruelties which they inflicted, the crimes which they perpetrated, and the miseries which they endured in the name of a mistaken religion. I do not permit myself here to touch upon the means by which, through a state of indifference, the Hindus and Musalmans alike may yet reach a higher level of belief. But I firmly believe that day will come; and that our system of education, which has hitherto produced only negative virtues, is the first, although distant stage towards it. Hitherto the English in India have been but poor iconoclasts after all.” I cannot compliment our author upon a straightforward system of education. If Government do not deal openly and fairly with its Mahomedan subjects, if it deals with them in the underhand way recommended by Dr. Hunter, I foresee much trouble both in our days and hereafter. Let it openly declare in Macaulay’s words that, “the present system tends not to accelerate the progress of truth, but to delay the natural death of expiring errors; that it gives an artificial encouragement to absurd history, to absurd metaphysics, forces a breed of scholars who find their scholarships an encumbrance and a blemish.” These words still apply to the present system of education, though written as long ago as in 1853. Had Lord Macaulay’s able minute been fully acted up to, we should have had a very different story to tell of education in this country. This is not, however

the place for a dissertation on the education of the people of India. I shall, at some future time, publish my views in their entirety on this important subject. The evils that now exist, however, owe their origin greatly to the want of union and sympathy between the rulers and the ruled, and ideas like Dr. Hunter's only tend to widen the gap. I admit that owing to the difference in the mode of life, there is but a limited number of native gentlemen with whom European gentlemen can have cordial intercourse; but this number will, I trust, increase largely every year. Let sympathy and confidence be instilled into the minds of the native community, and this desirable consummation is not far off. Let Government also try to remove the impression now prevalent amongst Mahomedans, that it is inimical to them, and desires their degradation. In conclusion, although cordially thanking Dr. Hunter for the good feeling which he at times evinces towards my fellow-countrymen, I cannot but regret the style in which he has written. I cannot divest myself of the idea that when he commenced his work, he was more imbued with the desire to further the interests of Mahomedans in India than is afterwards apparent in his pages. This Wahabi conspiracy has, I think, influenced his mind as he wrote; and he has allowed himself to be carried away by it. His work was politically a grave, and in a minor degree, an historical mistake. It is, however, hard, as I have already said, for one of the minority to attempt to remove the impression which literary skill like Dr. Hunter's has undoubtedly made on the minds of the Indian public. This impression was as regards the native community, heightened by Dr. Hunter's work having received the approbation of the highest functionary in India. I could not, however, in justice to myself and my co-religionists, have kept silence when such erroneous statements were thrown broadcast over the land. I have striven as much as in me lay to refute the errors published by Dr. Hunter, and although my efforts may have been in vain, I feel that I have done my duty.

APPENDICE

APPENDIX I.

DECISION OF THE MECCA LAW DOCTORS

(The Heads of the three Great Musalman Sects).

QUESTION.

‘What is your opinion (may your greatness continue for ever) on this question : Whether the country of Hindustan, the Rulers of which are Christians, and who do not interfere with all the injunctions of Islam, such as the ordinary daily Prayers, the Prayers of the two Ids etc., but do authorize departure from a few of the injunctions of Islam, such as the permission to inherit the property of his Muhammadan ancestor to one who changes his religion (being that of his ancestors), and becomes a Christian, is Dar-ul-Islam or not ? Answer the above, for which God will reward you.’

ANSWER No.

‘All praises are due to the Almighty, who is the Lord of all the Creation ! O Almighty, increase my knowledge !

As long as even some of the peculiar observances of Islam prevail in it, it is Dar-ul-Islam.

The Almighty is Omniscient, Pure, and High !

This is the Order passed by one who hopes for the secret favour of the Almighty, who praises God, and prays for blessings and peace on his Prophet.

(Signed) JAMAL IBN-I-ABDULLAH SHAIKH UMAR-UL-HANAFI, the present Mufti of Mecca (the Honoured). May God favour him and his father.’

(II)

ANSWER, No. II.

All praises are due to God, who is One ; and may the blessings of God be showered upon our Chief, Muhammad, and upon his descendants and companions, and upon the followers of his Faith !

O God ! I require guidance from Thee in righteousness.

Yes ! As long as even some of the peculiar observances of Islam prevail in it, it is Dar-ul-Islam.

The Almighty is Omniscient, Pure, and High !

This is written by one who hopes for salvation from the God of mercy. May God forgive him, and his parents and preceptors, and brothers and friends, and all Muhammadans.

(Signed) AHMAD BIN ZAINI DAHLAN, Mufti of the Shafi Sect of Mecca (the Protected).'

ANSWER No. III.

All praises are due to God who is One ! O ! Almighty ! increase my knowledge !

It is written in the Commentary of Dasoki that a Country of Islam does not become 'Dar-ul-Harb as soon as it passes into the hands of the Infidels, but only when all or most of the injunctions of Islam disappear therefrom.

God is Omniscient ! May the blessings of God be showered upon our Chief, Muhammad, and on his descendants and companions.

(Signed) Written by HUSAIN BIN IBRAHIM, Mufti of the Maliki Sect of Mecca (the Illustrious).'

APPENDIX II.

THE DECISION OF THE LAW DOCTORS OF NORTHERN INDIA.

TRANSLATION OF THE ISTIFTA OR QUESTION, PUT BY SYYID AMIR HUSAIN,
PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE COMMISSIONER OF BHAGALPUR.

What is your Decision, O men of learning and expounders of the law of Islam, in the following ?—

Whether a Jihad is lawful in India, a country formerly held by a Muhammadan ruler, and now held under the sway of a Christian Government, where the said Christian Ruler does in no way interfere with his Muhammadan subjects in the Rites prescribed by their Religion, such as Praying, Fasting, Pilgrimage, Zakat, Friday Prayer, and Jama'at, and gives them fullest protection and liberty in the above respects in the same way as a Muhammadan Ruler would do, and where the Muhammadan subjects have no strength and means to fight with their rulers; on the contrary, there is every chance of the war, if waged, ending with a defeat, and thereby causing an indignity to Islam.

Please answer, quoting your authority.

Fatwa dated the 17th Rabeeoossangee, 1287 H., corresponding with the 17th July, 1870.

The Musalmans here are protected by Christians, and there is no Jihad in a country where protection is afforded, as the absence of protection and liberty between Musalmans and Infidels is essential in a religious war, and that condition does not exist here. Besides, it is necessary that there should be a probability of victory to Musalman and glory to the Islams. If there be no such probability, the Jihad is unlawful.

Here the Moulavis quote Arabic passages from Manhajul Ghaffar and the Fatawa-i-Alamgiri, supporting the above Decision.

Seals of

MOULAVI ALI MUHAMMAD, of Lucknow ;
 MOULAVI ABDUL HAI, of Lucknow ;
 MOULAVI FAZLULLAH, of Lucknow ;
 MUHAMMAD NAIM, of Lucknow ;
 MOULAVI RAHMATULLAH, of Lucknow ;
 MOULAVI KUTAB-UD-DIN, of Dehli ;
 MOULAVI and MUFTI SADULLAH, of Lucknow ;
 MOULAVI LUTFULLAH, of Rampur ;
 MOULAVI ALUMALI, of Rampur.

APPENDIX III.

EXTRACT FROM "AN ACCOUNT OF THE LOYAL MUHAMMADANS OF INDIA."

"Be it known that the object of a Jihad among Mahomedans is not to practice treachery and cruelty ; and no sane man can, with the most distant approach to truth, apply that term to an insurrection characterised by violence, crime, and bloodshed, in defiance of, and utter disregard to, the Divine commands. And, further, a Jihad, according to the principles of Mahomedan faith, *really cannot take place* under the present *regime* ! The reason is, that the Mahomedans are living under the *protection* of their European rulers, and the protected cannot make a crusade against their protectors.

The British have obtained domination in Hindoostan by two modes, viz., by conquest and by cession. In either case, the Mahomedans have, as a natural consequence, become their subjects, and enjoy peace and protection under their administration, while the Government reposes confidence in their loyalty and submission. How then could the Mahomedans rise against the Government in a Jihad, when the very first condition of a religious war is, that there should not subsist the relation of protected and protectors between the Crusaders, and

those against whom the Crusade is undertaken ? This point is distinctly laid down and enforced in the book of *Alumgeeree*, in which the author says, that there are two indispensable requisites to a Jihad,—first, that there be no *ummun* or protection,—and secondly, that there be no treaty or engagement between the parties.

I will here call to my aid some of our sacred and learned authors to illustrate the relations of protected and protectors in a religious view.

In the *Hedaya* it is written that *Mustamun*, *i. e.*, protected, is a term applied to those who live in peace and security under a Government professing a different creed. This is precisely the case with us who abide under the protecting arm of the British.

Again, it is stated in the *Hedaya* and *Alumgeeree* that when a Mahomedan enjoys protection and security under the rule of a nation not of his own faith, it is in the highest degree infamous if, from a professedly religious motive, he commits any outrage upon the person or property of those by whom he is governed.

Our law provides, that when we of our own motion desire to elect a King to reign over us, he must be a professor of our faith, and be taken from the tribe of Koreish ; but if any man raises himself to supreme power by force of arms, it is by no means a *sine qua non* that he should be a believer in the Prophet ; and this of course implies that Mahomedans are enjoined to obey faithfully the ruler under whose dominion they may happen to dwell, be his creed what it may. In two of our religious books, entitled “*Tatarkhaee* and *Mooltugil*,” it is also written, that it is not at all essential that the King of the country in which Mahomedans reside, and by whom they are protected, should be a Mahomedan.

The precedent for this is found in the *Touret*, or Book of Moses, where it is recorded, that Joseph served Potiphar King of Egypt, and was obedient and faithful to him in all things, although Potiphar was not a Jew—(see Genesis ch. xxxix.)—In like manner the Mahomedans

dwell in obedience to the laws and Government of the British, who extend to them the canopy of their protection ; and this obedience is nothing more than the proper and bounden duty of their Mahomedan subjects, as inculcated and enforced by the precepts of our religion.

Now, although it is well known that the Government has not hitherto opposed any obstacle to the free use and observance of the ordinances of their religious subjects, and also, that it will *not* do so in the time to come, for the Queen in her Proclamation has graciously given a guarantee to that effect ; yet, allowing for the sake of argument, that this neutrality *were* violated, still *even then* the Mahomedans would not be justified in rebelling against the Government. All that they could do under such circumstances would be to expatriate themselves.

In one of the commentaries on the Alkoran called *Tufseer Ahmudee*, it is written, that if any person is debarred the privilege of worshipping God in conformity with his education and belief, by reason of the arbitrary edicts, of Tyrants or Kaffirs, he is perfectly justified in withdrawing into *another country*, under the Government of which he may be permitted that liberty of conscience, which was despotically denied to him in the land of his birth or adoption."

APPENDIX IV.

LETTER FROM SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADUR, C. S. I., TO THE
EDITOR OF THE PIONEER, PUBLISHED IN THE ISSUE OF
THE 4TH APRIL, 1871.

DEAR SIR,—It is to be regretted that certain Anglo-Indian journals have misinterpreted the *Futwa* alluded to in your article of to-day's issue, and have deduced therefrom that Mahomedans in India would be justified in waging war against our Government were the prospects of success certain.

As a staunch well-wisher of the British Government, and at the same time as a well-wisher to true Wahabeeism, I venture to claim the indulgence of space for these few lines in your next issue. It may shock some of my worthy friends to see me standing forth as the friend of Wahabeeism, but I trust they will acquit me from the imputation of being a Wahabee in the sense of being a Wahabee conspirator. Wahabeeism, as exemplified by certain misguided men in India, is not Wahabeeism at all ; and those who are really guilty of conspiring against Government are not acting up to the principles of their religious tenets. I say "really guilty" advisedly, as I have no doubt in my own mind that some persons, whose names I do not like to mention, were falsely imputed with such charges through the enmity and spite of certain parties. The true nature of the Wahabee case now pending in the Patna Court is unknown to me.

As regards the portion of the *Futwa* above alluded to, as having been misinterpreted by the *Englishman* and other journals, I will now say a few words. The learned Moulavis, under whose authority the *Futwa* has been given out, declare Jihad against Government, to be unlawful and unwarranted by the Mahomedan religion, and in support of their verdict quote the following precepts :—

I. Mahomedans who live under the protection of a Government professing a different faith, are not justified in declaring a religious war against it.

II. When there exists a treaty or peace between Mahomedans and some other people of a different religion, Jihad against the latter is unlawful.

III. Jihad is allowable when there is every probability of victory to Mahomedans and glory to Islam.

It is the last which has caused the mistake into which Anglo-Indian journals have fallen, which has made them opine that were the Mahomedans strong enough to cope with the British, those in India would be justified in rising in rebellion against Government. This is a perfectly erroneous interpretation of the clause in question. Its real meaning is

that when of two independent kingdoms, the one is Mahomedan, and the other of a different faith, when there is no treaty between the two, and when in the non-Mahomedan country Mahomedans are ill-treated and are interdicted from preaching their religion, then the followers of Mahomed are enjoined to consider their strength and chances of success ; and should they deem the latter likely, they are then to draw the sword for the glory and welfare of Islam. For example, should the king of Persia think his chances of success against the Russian Emperor good, should that Emperor ill-treat Mahomedans, he would be justified, according to his religion, in declaring war at once. This not being the case, he is justified in remaining quiet. The Mahomedans in India are, as shown in the *Futwa*, in no way justified in engaging in any project having for its object the subversion of the English Government. They have perfect freedom of speech, and no one interferes with their religion ; and even were their religion interfered with, their proper course, according to the Mahomedan religion, would be to leave the country, and not to rebel against Government.

As regards the Wahabees in India, as far as my experience goes, their principles are identical with those of other Mahomedans as regards the unlawfulness of a Jihad against our Government. In 1857, when Bakht Khan was in Delhi, and endeavoured to compel the Moulavis of that city to issue a *Futwa*, declaring a Jihad against the British Government lawful, two persons, both Wahabees, boldly opposed him, backed up though he was by the bayonets of his soldiery. One of these was a famous Moulavi holding an influential position in Delhi. Again, only one Wahabee joined the rebels during the Mutiny, and he was forced to do so. I dare say I shall not be believed in my statement that true Wahabeeism is not inimical to our Government, and I have no doubt but that many people will abuse me for my Wahabee proclivities. By the English I shall be suspected as an intriguer, and by many of my ignorant fellow country-men I shall be condemned as a well-wisher to the Government, as one who lends his name and authority towards checking all unlawful (though in their eyes lawful) and ambitious schemes. I am prepared for—am indeed perfectly accustomed to—being misunderstood by both. Such has been my lot now for many years.

In conclusion, I will only say that I trust the Patna trial will be closely watched both by the Government and by the public. If the prisoners are really guilty of the offence with which they are charged, they have been guilty of a great crime against the true principles of their religion. Let their punishment be sharp and severe. Government, however, must bear in mind that the sects called Wahabees and Bidatis are bitter enemies, that their feelings towards one another are as bitter as were those of the Roman Catholics towards the Protestants in the days of the Reformation ; and that it is therefore not at all improbable in this land of intrigue that false charges have been laid against innocent men, and that hundreds of false witnesses will testify to their guilt.

APPENDIX V. *

A LETTER FROM SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADUR, C. S. I., TO THE
EDITOR OF THE PIONEER, PUBLISHED IN THE ISSUE
OF THE 14TH APRIL, 1871.

DEAR SIR,—In an article which appeared in the *Englishman* of the 3rd instant, there are several points which seem to me to deserve notice, as the statements and deductions of the writer are calculated to leave an erroneous impression on the minds of the English community in India. The writer, in the second paragraph of his article, states that “the plain meaning of the text of the Koran is that the followers of Islam shall reduce the whole earth to obedience ; giving to every nation the alternatives of conversion, a submission almost amounting to slavery, or death.” Doubtless, Mahomedans would be greatly pleased were they masters of the world, but that the Koran inculcates such conduct on the part of the conquerors is utterly and entirely wrong. I will here quote an extract from one of my essays on the Life of Mohammed, and would, in support of the opinions given in the same,

quote Godfrey Higgins, John Davenport, and the great historian Gibbon. "The remark that the 'sword is the inevitable penalty for the denial of Islam' is one of the gravest charges falsely imputed to this faith by the professors of other religions, and arises from the utter ignorance of those who make the accusation. Islam inculcates and demands a hearty and sincere belief in all that it teaches ; and that genuine faith which proceeds from a person's heart cannot be obtained by force or violence. Judicious readers will not fail to observe that the above quoted remark is entirely contrary to the fundamental principles of the Moslem faith, wherein it is inculcated, in the clearest language possible,—'Let there be no forcing in the religion ; the right way has been made clearly distinguishable from the wrong one' (chap. X., 98). And also, ' If the Lord had pleased, all who are on the earth would have believed together ; and wilt thou force men to be believers ? No man can believe but by the permission of God, and He will pour out His indignation on those who will not understand.' "

The writer then proceeds to quote Abdul Aziz and Abdul Hai *in re* the Fatiwas published by them and sums up thus :—“ We have given these decisions word for word, and there can be no question that up to the last four or five years the whole Musalman community regarded British India as a country of the enemy. In such a *country the majority consider that the Faithful are either at liberty to, or bound to, wage war against the Infidels.* The obligation is only a question of degree, and the Mahomedan Literary Society of Calcutta, in their late proceedings, seem to assume this. But they get rid of the difficulty, and evade the necessity for rebellion, by denying that India is Dar-ul-Harb, and affirming that it is Dar-ul-Islam, a country of the Faithful.” I cannot congratulate the Mahomedan Literary Society of Calcutta on their assertion that India is Dar-ul-Islam, and of their thus evading the necessity for rebellion. India, in spite of the Calcutta Mahomedan Literary Society, is Dar-ul-Harb, but not in the sense in which the *Englishman* interprets it. My readers are aware that in Dar-ul-Islam, usury is prohibited. Now, a country may be Dar-ul-Harb in two senses,—1st, that of its being a foreign country in which it is lawful for Mahomedans to take

interest for their money ; 2nd, in the sense of its being lawful for the Faithful to make religious war (*jihad*) upon it. India is Dar-ul-Harb in the former sense, but not in the latter. Great Britain is Dar-ul-Harb as regards usury, but not as regards *jihad*, because the treaty between it and Turkey is binding on the latter. The writer in the *Englishman* assumes that the word " Faithful" applies to the Mahomedans in India, and that they are therefore at liberty, or bound, to wage war against Government. This is quite an erroneous supposition, as Mahomedans, be they dwellers in Dar ul-Harb or Dar-ul-Islam, are all prohibited from rebellion against a Government which interferes in no way with the free worship of their religion. The word " Faithful," as regards *jihad*, applies only to the *Mahomedan subjects of a Mahomedan ruler* as pointed out in my letter of the 31st ultimo. A *jihad* would be perfectly lawful for such Mahomedans against an Infidel country which oppressed Mahomedans. A *jihad* by the Mahomedans of India against their rulers would be a false one, would be a rebellion *pure et simple*, and the misguided men who took part in it would, according to their religion, deserve death. Were I to have to judge such men, my sentence, in conformity with Mahomedan Law, on their being proved guilty, would be in accordance with what I have now stated.

In former days two questions agitated the minds of our forefathers in this country, viz—(1) Was it lawful for Mahomedans to lend money at interest here ? (2) If so, was it allowable for Mahomedans to reside in India ? These two points were referred for decision to Moulvie Abdul Aziz, but not a word was said in the reference about *jihad*. I would specially draw attention to this, as it is on this question that the *Englishman* and even many Mahomedans have fallen into error. Abdul Aziz, in his reply to the first point, said that India, according to the doctrine of Abu Hanifa, (whose followers all Indian Mahomedans are) was not Dar-ul-Harb, but that it was so according to Imam Mahomed and Imam Abu Yusuf. He himself ruled that India was Dar-ul-Harb as regarded the lawfulness of taking usury. Not a word did he say about *jihad*. On this *Futwa* appearing, the author met with reproaches on all sides, and a refutation of his decision appeared shortly after. The

following are its sentiments :—"Under the conditions specified you declare that India is not Dar-ul-Harb, but you then contradict your own words and call India Dar-ul-Harb, only as far as regards the validity of accepting interest by the Mahomedans of the country. This amounts to pious fraud for wordly prosperity, but those who accept such interest cannot be free from sin in the eyes of the Almighty." My readers may be curious to know the person who wrote this refutation. Its author was no other than the founder of Wahabeeism in India, Moulvie Ismail. A copy of the original refutation will be gladly forwarded to the *Englishman* if required.

On the second question, regarding the lawfulness of Mahomedans remaining in India, Moulvie abdul Aziz replied as follows. I give the question and his reply word for word.

Question.—"As India in your (Abdul Aziz's) judgment is Dar-ul-Harb, and to take interest in this country is lawful, should the Mahomedans of India live in it, make profits, and observe obedience to its rulers, or are they bound to abandon the country?"

Answer.—"It is not unlawful for the Mahomedans of India to live in this country, to make profits, and to obey their rulers, so far as their profits and obedience are not against their religious tenets; they are under no obligation to leave the country; because the Infidels (our rulers) have not as yet prohibited them from reading their prayers and Azan, or from the performance of other religious duties. When the rulers of the country do interdict these, as the Infidels of Mecca did to our Prophet, then Mahomedans shall be bound to leave the country."

I think I have conclusively shown that the inferences drawn by the *Englishman* are, to a great extent, erroneous, and that Mahomedans in India have no call whatever to rise in rebellion against their rulers. A more careful examination of the facts of the case, both on their part and on the part of English journalists, would have saved the country a great deal of unnecessary agitation. A little knowledge is often a dangerous thing, and the *Englishman* will doubtless regret having penned the last

paragraph of the article under discussion. None of the *Futwas* of the last eighty years have been, nor is it necessary that they should be, reversed.

APPENDIX VI.

AN ARTICLE WRITTEN BY SYED AHMED KHAN BAHADUR,
C. S. I., AND PUBLISHED IN THE ALLYGURH INSTITUTE
GAZETTE OF THE 12TH MAY, 1871.

Some of my readers will think that the much disputed question of Dar-ul-Islam and Dar-ul-Harb has already been gone into sufficiently, and requires no more elucidation, but I would remark that though the matter has been much talked of yet it has been little understood.

It is not my intention in this article to discuss the point with reference to any particular place or country. I wish only to explain to the public the true signification and the proper application of the words Dar-ul-Islam and Dar-ul-Harb, and also the ordinances relating to each.

The words Dar-ul-Islam and Dar-ul-Harb do not occur in the *Koran*, nor they are found in any of the *Hadises* (sayings of the Prophet Mahomet). Only one *Hadis* which allows usury to the Mahomedans, but which does not rank in authority with other *Hadises*, and is consequently not very reliable, contains the word Dar-ul-Harb. When the professors of the Mahomedan religion compiled the laws of their faith, they made use of these two words as special technicalities. The primary signification of the word Dar-ul-Harb is "The House of Strife," and that of Dar-ul-Islam, "House of Islam." They were never used in their original sense in Mahomedan Law except in their secondary meaning. Dar-ul-Harb is a mere technical name for a country not governed by Mahomedan Laws, in other words a country not under a Mahomedan Government. Again, a country governed by Mahomedan Laws and having a Mahomedan Government is called Dar-ul-Islam.

Now from the above signification of the words in question it might be inferred that a country brought under the subjection of a Mahomedan Government would be converted into Dar-ul-Islam, similarly a country conquered from the Mahomedans by an infidel ruler, into Dar-ul-Harb. Reference, however, to the commandments relating to each of these two classes of countries will show that there are places which, in reality, are neither Dar-ul-Islam nor Dar-ul-Harb, though for some special reason, they may be called by either of these names.

It is generally believed that Imam Abu Hanifa differs from Imams Mahomed and Abu Yusuf as to the circumstances under which Dar-ul-Islam becomes Dar-ul-Harb, but in reality, the inconsistency is merely nominal. According to Imam Abu Hanifa, the following three conditions make a Dar-ul-Islam Dar-ul-Harb.

I. "If the rule of the Infidels be predominant in the country."

II. If it be not surrounded with other regions under Mahomedan rule, in other words if the Government of the country be firm and settled."

III. "If the position of the faithful and the non-believing population of the country who were at first under the protection of a Mahomedan Government and were governed by Mahomedan Laws be altered, and their protection be vested in an Infidel ruler."

In the opinion of Imam Mahomed and Abu Yusuf, the first of the foregoing three conditions was clearly sufficient for the settlement of the question ; they thought that the other two conditions were only the concomitant results of the first ; and this is the fact.

Now, the ordinances connected with Dar-ul-Harb apply to two distinct classes of Mahomedans. The first class includes Mahomedans living in an Infidel country (Dar-ul-Harb) under a foreign rule as subjects ; and the second, comprises the Mahomedan population of a country governed by an independent ruler of their own faith.

Their religion enjoins on the first class as follows :—

I. "They must obey their rulers, abstain from war or conspiracy against them, and must give no help to the opponents of their Government, otherwise they lay themselves open to the charge of rebellion."

II. "Punishments fixed by Mahomedan Law for certain sins will not be held good with regard to offenders amongst them, but they shall be requited with penalties suitable to their circumstances."

III. "Some of the contracts bearing upon sale and purchase, and borrowing and lending money, held unlawful in Dar-ul-Islam, shall be considered lawful for them in Dar-ul-Harb."

IV. "If the Government under which they live interdict them from the free discharge of their religious duties, they shall leave the country without rising up in arms against the Government, as in the time of our Prophet, the true followers of Mahomed, when oppressed by the non-believers, quietly withdrew from Mecca to Medina and Abyssinia, the latter country being at that time under a Christian Ruler. But in a Dar-ul-Islam, if the Mahomedan ruler of the country acts contrary to the Law, his Mahomedan subjects are authorised to dethrone him, to try his case in an open Court, and if necessary, to take up arms to accomplish their object ; because, according to Mahomedan religion, the Kalif or the King, by whatever name the ruler of a country may be called, possesses no more power than the President of the Government of the United States of America."

Let us now turn to the commandments enjoined upon the Mahomedans forming the second class.

They are authorised to make Jihad against an Infidel Government if they have sufficient reason to believe that their fellow-religionists living under that Government are oppressed and prohibited in the free discharge of their religious duties, provided there exists no treaty between them, and also provided that they have good chances of bringing the war to a successful issue as happened in the case of Mecca in the time of our Prophet, and lately in that of the Sikh Government during the reign of Ranjit Sinha.

It will thus be seen, that an Infidel Government in which the Mahomedans enjoy every sort of peace and security, discharge their religious duties with perfect freedom, and which is connected with a Mahomedan Government by a treaty, is not Dar-ul-Islam, because it is a Non-Mahomedan Government, but we may call it so as regards the peace and religious freedom which the Moslems enjoy under its protection ; nor is it Dar-ul-Harb, because the treaty existing between it and the Moslem Government makes Jihad against it unlawful. It may however be called Dar-ul-Harb as it is not a Mahomedan Government. The position of Hindustan is exactly such as described in the last two sentences.

In conclusion, allow me, readers, to hope that I have thus drawn a brief but sufficiently clear and distinguishing line between Dar-ul-Harb and Dar-ul-Islam which will obviate all confusion on the point for the future.

The authorities on which I rely in support of my above statements are :—

- 1.—Alamgiri.
- 2.—Durre Mukhtar.
- 3.—Tahetavi.
- 4.—Shami.
- 5.—Siyarul Kabir.

APPENDIX VII.

AN ARTICLE ON JIHAD, PUBLISHED IN THE EDITORIAL COLUMNS
OF THE PIONEER OF THE 23RD NOVEMBER, 1871.

JIHAD.—There is a passage in the address lately delivered by Sir William Muir at Moradabad which strikes us as of unmistakeable import ; it is that in which he lays down the principles which have been

always held by the British Government in its relations with its non-Christian subjects, both Musalman and Hindu. "The Musalman, without let or hindrance, performs his *Azan*, and observes his prayers and festivals, his *Mohurrum*, his fasts, and his pilgrimages: and so also the Hindu, of whatever sect, celebrates his worship with all its attendant conditions of holy places, fairs, and batheings, in whatever manner he thinks proper. In short, every one throughout the land is absolutely free to serve God according to the dictates of his own conscience." These words, we conceive, define exactly the position of our Government towards its subjects; and taking them for our text, we propose to examine, and in some respects to traverse, the position laid down by Mr. Hunter in his recent work on "Our Indian Musalmans."

We have before stated, and need not repeat here, our objections to the *ignoratio elenchi* involved in discussing a question, the import of which extends to the whole of India, upon grounds which, if true, are true only of Lower Bengal. It would be easy to show that, if Muhammadan holidays are neglected in Calcutta, they are fully recognized in these Provinces; if Musalmans are deprived of place and power in Bengal, they have their full share of official emoluments in Northern India. But this is not the matter now before us. The position taken up by our author may be thus briefly stated:—India is no longer a *Dar-ul-Islam*, or country of the Faithful. Were it so, it would be the *duty* of every Musalman to maintain it in its position as such by armed rebellion or *jihad*. It is a *Dar-ul-harb*, or country of the enemy—because it is no longer ruled by a Moslem ruler—because it is no longer administered under the law of Islam—and because the Moslems remaining therein are no longer in the possession of the plenary status of a Muhammadan, the "*amán-ul-awwal*." But *jihad* is not, notwithstanding these conditions, lawful, because the Moslems are here protected, *moostámin*, and are permitted to exercise their religious duties without let or hindrance. Thus the duty of *jihad* would actually be affirmed by the decision that India is a *Dar-ul-Islam*; while it is shown not to apply under the conditions in which it exists as a *Dar-ul-*

harb. Thus, too, the Wahabis, who are assumed to hold that, because India is a *Dar-ul-harb*, therefore *jihad* is lawful and incumbent, are convinced of ignorance of the law of Islam.

It will be observed that the whole of the above conclusions depend for their validity on the interconnection between *jihad*, or war in defence of religion, and the distinction between the *Dar-ul-Islam*, and the *Dar-ul-harb*; and further, on the assumption that every country *must* be to the Faithful either *Dar-ul-harb* or *Dar-ul-Islam*. If, therefore, we can show that this classification of inhabited countries is *not* an exhaustive dichotomy, and that the law and practice of Islam recognizes, and has always recognized, a third term, under which neither is the country a country of the Faithful nor is *jihad* lawful, we shall have placed the discussion as to the conscientious loyalty of our Musalman subjects on quite other grounds than the distinction drawn by Mr. Hunter—upon grounds on which, we may hope, every Musalman will join us in concluding that he may be heartily faithful both to his religion and his Queen.

First, what is *jihad*? It is war in defence of the faith “*fi sabil-láh*.” But it has its conditions, and, except under these, it is unlawful. It must be against those who are not only *Kafirs*, but also* “obstruct the exercise of the faith.” The doctors of the law in all ages, not merely the Moulvies, Meccan or of Northern India, whom Mr. Hunter quotes, have laid down that to constitute the essential conditions for *jihad* on the part of protected Mosalmans as against a Christian power protecting them, there must be *positive* oppression or obstruction to the Moslems in the exercise of their faith; not merely want of countenance, negative withholding of support, or absence of profession of the faith; and further, this obstruction and oppression which justifies *jihad* must be, not in civil, but in religious matters; it must impair the foundation of some one of the “pillars of Islam,” and not merely touch the existence of Kazees, the maintenance of the tombs of saints (a practice declared by the stricter Moslems to be heretical), or the administration of the country through Moslem officials. These are

* Sura 47, v. 1.

merely negative abstentions from the faith (*kufr*), not that positive oppression (*zulm*) and obstruction to the exercise of the faith (*sadd*) which alone can justify *jihad*.

Now the *Dar-ul-harb* is essentially and absolutely a country in which these conditions exist, and in which *jihad* is lawful. It cannot be according to the natural meaning of the term, and so long as words are used in their primary sense, a country where *jihad* is illegal. *Dar-ul-Harb* does not mean "the country of the enemy," as translated through-out his book by Mr. Hunter ; but "a country of *war*"—a country in which it is the duty of Moslems to wage war with all their might against the oppressors of their faith, or, in default of ability to wage war, from which they should flee with all convenient speed, as the Prophet fled from unbelieving Mecca. There is no alternative. If a land is "the home of war," war must be waged, or the Faithful remove therefrom. It is a mere abuse of language to apply the name *Dar-ul-harb* to a country with which it is lawful for true believers to maintain any friendly relations whatever ; it is a mere legal subtlety to declare that a country is the "home of war," and yet to allow that Moslems therein enjoy "*amán*," whether the greater or lesser. We do not deny that the title *Dar-ul-harb* has been applied, even by Moslem doctors of authority and weight, to a country in which *jihad* is not lawful ; but we contend that this is a misapplication of the term : *Dar-ul-harb* cannot mean a country where war cannot lawfully be waged in defence of the faith. Its use as the designation of such a country is a mere dialectical evolution, and a departure from its original sense. The proper term would under these conditions rather be *Dar-ul-amán*, or "land of security," in which a Moslem may lawfully reside as *moostâmin*, or seeker of *amán*.

This is no fanciful theory unsupported by precedent or tradition, but is, and has been, the conclusion arrived at from precedents reaching back to the days of the Prophet himself. Islam is essentially a system of precedent ; no least act of the Prophet or his Followers is without its import in defining the relations of the Faith with the World ; and

among these acts of Muhammad we find one, the bearing of which is unmistakeable.

During the early days of Islam, while it barely maintained itself in the Hâshimite quarter of Mecca, and Muhammad relied for protection against the unbelieving Koreish mainly upon his uncle Abu Tâlib (himself an unbeliever), in the fifth year of the Prophet's ministry, took place the first Hegira, or flight from the land of persecution to "a country wherein no one was wronged—a land of righteousness." This was the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, ruled over by the *Najâshee Negus*, "a just king." Among the emigrants on this occasion were the Prophet's own son-in-law, Othman, the son of Affân, and his wife, the Prophet's daughter. Here the emigrants were kindly treated, and all the efforts of the Koreish to dislodge them were unavailing. Next year, the sixth of the Ministry, the persecution at Mecca redoubling, a second emigration thither took place, more numerous than the first, so that, we are told, the number of the Faithful in this Christian country reached 101, without counting their little ones. Here they dwelt in peace and quietness: many of them remained till long after the victorious promulgation of Islam, and did not rejoin Muhammad until the expedition to Khâiber, in the seventh year of the Hegira.

It is difficult to overrate the importance of this incident. We have actually the conditions of *jihad* fulfilled on the one hand, and an exact counterpart of the conditions under which the Moslems now live in India on the other. At Mecca the alternative of *jihad* or *hijrat*, fight or flight, presented itself. Those who were strong enough to fight remained, and upheld the faith in the blockaded quarter of Abu Tâlib. Those who were weak fled, and fled to a Christian land. There they found kindness and hospitality, and dwelt many years in safety under the protection of the "People of the Book."* The Koran says—"Of a truth ye shall find the most violent of men in enmity against those who believe, the Jews and those who have associated others in companionship with God; and ye shall find the nearest of men in charity to those who believe, those who say—We are Nazarenes. This is

* Sura V., V. 86.

because among them are priests and monks, and because they are not puffed up." Here, then, we have the Prophet's own authority, both by act and precept, for the recognition by a Moslem of the existence of a non-Moslem country, in which it is lawful for him to reside under the protection of a ruler of an alien faith : a country in which *jihad* is positively prohibited by the fact that it is itself a *maman*, a refuge from a country in which *jihad* or flight was a duty. The condition of the Moslems in India under British rule is precisely similar. They are absolutely free from interference with their faith ; they manage the internal affairs of their community by their own law ; they perform their pilgrimage, and celebrate their Eeds, without let or hindrance.

We have thus shown that the duty of *jihad* in reference to Moslems who live under the protection of a Christian Government, is fenced about with strict conditions, which must be fulfilled before the duty can become incumbent : that none of these conditions exist in British India : that British India is, on the other hand, a country in which that protection is afforded to the Faithful with which they met at the hands of the Christian ruler of Abyssinia ; and that consequently, so long as that protection exists, we must conclude that insurrection would be a crime. To call such a country *Dar-ul-harb*, in the strict and only legitimate sense of the word, is absurd. It can only be so called in that constructive and improper sense in which Musalman doctors have applied it to all non-Moslem countries.

It appears to us that Mr. Hunter has somewhat misunderstood the bearing of the decisions of the doctors of Mecca and Northern India which he quotes—the one declaring India to be *Dar-ul-Islam*, and the other declaring it to be *Dar-ul-harb*. We detect no such insidious incitement to revolt in the first as he declares to reside in it. In fact, we believe that both authorities, looking at the question propounded from slightly different points of view, meant much the same. The *Dar-ul-harb* of the Indian doctors was not the real *Dar-ul-harb*, but the constructive one, which we have suggested might rather be called *Dar-ul-amán* : in this the free exercise of the faith is secured to the believers, and *jihad* is unlawful. But looked at from the other side, this condition might

also be defined as *Dar-ul-Islam* and as such the great body of Musalmans in India regard, and have always regarded, it. At any rate, the conditions of *jihad* are to the Arabian doctors as to those of India the same ; whether under a *Dar-ul-Islam* or a *Dar-ul-harb*, they do not vary : and by whichever name the intermediate relation in which we have shewn British India to stand to the Moslem may be called, *jihad* is equally unauthorized, and condemned by the concurrent voice of Musalman tradition, from the Prophet to the doctors of to-day.

In his portraiture of the Wahabis as set forth in his work, Mr. Hunter uniformly describes them as the preachers of insurrection. Occasionally we meet with a qualifying sentence : but throughout the book the general inference is that a Wahabi is necessarily a traitor, "a revolutionist alike in politics and in religion"—a "preacher of holy war." If this were so, the Wahabi would be broadly marked off from all other Muhammadan sects by his denial of those conditions which, in the opinion of the orthodox, are absolutely necessary to warrant *jihad*. But it is not so. A Wahabi is not even necessarily an exclusive follower of Abdul Wahhab ; he may be a Hanafi, a Maliki, or a member of any other Musalman sect—and almost invariably denominates himself (so far as our observation in these Provinces has gone) as a Sunni. A Wahabi is simply a pure worshipper—a puritan of Islam, a follower of the uncontaminated faith of the Prophet. To represent him as uniformly a secret conspirator against constituted authority—a worker in darkness, a preacher of sedition—is a libel. We could point to many men in the service of Government, than whom Government possesses no more faithful or trusted servants, who openly and fearlessly and honorably avow that they are Wahabis, and glory in the name. Nay, more : these men are not only now the trusted servants of the State, but many of them were tried in the hottest fire of the Mutiny, and remained faithful. Had they been preachers of *jihad*—had rebellion been of the essence of Wahabi-ism—this could never have been. And we commend their conduct to Mr. Hunter's notice, as a complete reply, *on the part of the Wahabis themselves*, to the "crucial question" suggested by him in the note to page 142 of his book.

APPENDIX VIII.

A LETTER FROM A MUSALMAN OF AGRA, PRESENTLY ON A
 VISIT TO ENGLAND, PUBLISHED IN THE "TIMES"
 IN NOVEMBER LAST.

—♦—
 TO THE EDITOR OF THE "TIMES."

SIR,—I have read with much pleasure the letter by Colonel Nassau Lees in the *Times* of the 14th ultimo. Though very favorable to Her Majesty's Mahomedan subjects in India, it is not very fair to a sect which it is the fashion just now to represent in an odious light, and I beg to offer a few remarks with a view to prevent much injustice being done to a large, deserving, and influential portion of the Mahomedan community. As it is an important subject, I hope you will do me the favor to give it space in your columns. •

The Wahabi question has recently been the cause of great alarm both to the English authorities and to the Mahomedan population of India, and the former, as I understand from some communications, seem determined to extirpate, if they can, the whole sect that have the misfortune to be called Wahabis. • But I much fear the Government officers have fallen into a fatal mistake, inasmuch as they appear to take Wahabis in general for disaffected people and disloyal subjects. A Wahabi, as far as Mahomedan religion is concerned, means nothing more than one who has the most firm and implicit belief in the unity of God, and who has no faith in the supernatural powers of saints, nor in the superstitions which derive no support from true Mahomedanism, but have, somehow or other, obtained credence among different sects. In point of fact a Wahabi is the faithful observer of the injunctions of the Koran and the precepts of the Prophet, and his religious opinions are anything but irrational. I cannot help believing that patient inquiry would show that more than half of the Mahomedan population of India belong to that sect, and yet they are as loyal subjects as it is possi-

ble for a foreigner to be. To suspect, therefore, all these who are called Wahabis of disloyalty, and to treat them accordingly, would be the surest way of spreading disaffection among loyal subjects, and this would be as dangerous as to pass over without notice real disaffection.

The English people appear to have fallen into another mistake. They believe that Wahabi-ism imposes upon the holders of that faith the duty of making religious war (*Jihad*) upon "infidels." There cannot be a greater error. The injunction to make *Jihad* is, no doubt, one of the principal commandments (or to use the literal translation of Arabic, is "one of the pillars of Islam"), the observance of which is as incumbent upon any Mussulman, as upon a Wahabi. But this injunction is qualified by many conditions; and as it is a religious duty of a Mahomedan to make *Jihad* when circumstances make it imperative, so it is not the less important for him to abstain from it when circumstances do not call for it. The decisions of the Mahomedan law authorities of India have set at rest the question that the conditions which make a country *Dar-ul-harb* (home of war); that is, a country where it becomes imperatively necessary, on religious grounds for the Mahomedans either to make *Jihad* or to give up their residence there, are not found under a Government which has spread tranquillity over the length and breadth of its dominions, administers justice with impartiality, keeps the Mahomedans in safety, and does not interfere with their religion. The Wahabis, therefore, famed as they are for the religious observance of their tenets, are the first people to believe in the illegality of *Jihad* against the English. I, for one, can point out some persons of great influence who, though Wahabis to the backbone, have proved themselves by various tests, the most sincere friends to their Christian Sovereign. In the late Mutiny, at the risk of their lives and of the destruction of their families, they took no part against the English, simply because it was contrary to their faith to make *Jihad* against them. They consulted their doctors over and over again at the time the Mutiny of 1857 was in full blaze in places and in conditions where nothing was to be feared from an English magistrate, and the British power was almost prostrated, and there was very little expectation of

its restoration. Even the decisions of those troublesome days prove that the Wahabis were legally forbidden to wage war. There can be no doubt that the true Wahabis adhered to these decisions, and consequently were a great source of strength to the English in the days of their misfortune. Wahabi-ism is as averse from making *Jihad* against the English under present circumstances as *Sunnism* or *Síáism*, for the texts of the Koran which treat about *Jihad* are so clear and precise that they could hardly be interpreted in more than one way, and the inferences drawn from them are almost one and the same among different sects.

But if there are people in India who, as Colonel Nassau Lees justly says, "do not recognize the doctrines" or the law of the orthodox Moslem," who hate the English for no other ostensible reason than that they are English and Christians, and who have kept the "North-Western frontier in a state of chronic warfare," such people ought not to have been called true Mahomedans, and much less Wahabis. They are rebels at heart, instigated by avarice and love of plunder, and have induced others who are as unprincipled as themselves to make war against their Christian Sovereign. I have no doubt that most of them are men who, in one way or another, have become outcasts from their own society, or who are guilty of some crime, but have succeeded in escaping punishment. These people, as described by Dr. Hunter, constitute "a perennial stream of malcontents. Absconding debtors, escaped convicts, spendthrifts, too ruined to be at peace with social order, traitors too guilty to hope for mercy from the law."

It is, therefore, necessary for the sake of India, no less than for the sake of justice, that the British Government should be careful to discriminate between the Wahabis and rebels before it takes any decisive steps in the matter; for, unless such distinction is made, there is great danger of giving rise to a state of things which may prove still more disastrous to the English Government in India.

The Anglo-Indians seem so much prejudiced against the Wahabis that they appear glad to find some excuse for giving them a bad name.

For instance, the murder of the late lamented Mr. Justice Norman has been laid at the door of Wahabi-ism, and some of your correspondents took the opportunity to give expression to their animosity by unsupported statements that the murderer was a Wahabi. It is idle for me to say whether he was so or not till further testimony is at hand, but, as far as the telegrams you have published can give any information, it is clear that no Wahabi name has been mentioned. Besides, it is impossible to see in what way the assassin could have hoped to benefit the case of Amir Khan by murdering a Judge who was sure to be replaced by another of the same nation, religion, and almost of similar Qualifications. I cannot help thinking that the assassin had some personal grudge against the late Officiating Chief Justice, and having an irritable and excitable temper, for which all his countrymen (Afghans) are famous, was probably unable to curb his savage propensities, and so murdered his victim.

Apologizing for the length of the letter, I have the honor to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

A MUSSULMAN OF AGRA.

